Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/modernphilology16chicuoft

65
409
096

MODERN PHILOLOGY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON AND EDINBURGH

THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA
TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO, FUKUOKA, SENDAI

THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY
SHANGHAI

MODERN PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

JOHN M. MANLY, *General Editor*

CHARLES R. BASKERVILL, *Managing Editor*

WILLIAM A. NITZE — STARR W. CUTTING — TOM PEETE CROSS

KARL PIETSCH — FRANCIS A. WOOD — JEFFERSON B. FLETCHER

T. ATKINSON JENKINS — ERNEST H. WILKINS

ADVISORY BOARD

JAMES W. BRIGHT — FRANCIS B. GUMMERE

GEORGE HEMPL — GEORGE L. KITTREDGE

CALVIN THOMAS — FREDERICK M. WARREN

FREDERIC I. CARPENTER

VOLUME SIXTEEN

1918–1919

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

PB
1
M7
v.16

Published
May, June, July, August, September, October, November, December, 1918
January, February, March, April, 1919

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

CONTENTS

B. Sprague Allen. The Reaction against William Godwin . . 225
Neil C. Arvin. The Technique of Scribe's *Comédies-Vaudevilles* . 159
F. B. Barton. Laurence Sterne and Théophile Gautier . . . 205
Arthur C. L. Brown. The Grail and the English *Sir Perceval*. I. . 553
J. Douglas Bruce. Pelles, Pellinor, and Pellean in the Old French Arthurian Romances. I and II . . . . . 113 and 337
John L. Campion. Ein Tristanfragment 89
D. H. Carnahan. The Financial Difficulties of Lamartine . . 143
W. A. Chamberlin. Longfellow's Attitude toward Goethe . . 57
Donald Lemen Clark. The Requirements of a Poet: A Note on the Sources of Ben Jonson's *Timber*, Paragraph 130 413
Ronald S. Crane. A Note on Richardson's Relation to French Fiction 495
Tom Peete Cross. The Gaelic "Ballad of the Mantle" . . . 649
E. Preston Dargan. Studies in Balzac. II. Critical Analysis of Realism 351
W. F. DeMoss. Spenser's Twelve Moral Virtues "According to Aristotle" . . . . . 23 and 245
Vincente García de Diego. Formas Regresivas Españolas . . 579
E. O. Eckelman. Wilhelm Raabe's Trilogy, *Der Hungerpastor, Abu Telfan, Der Schüdderump* 525
Oliver Farrar Emerson. The West Midland Prose Psalter 90:10 . 53
Charles Paul Giessing. The Plagiarized Book Reviews of C. F. Weisse in the *Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften* 77
Arthur Rollins Graves. Intercalations in the Novels of Alfred Meissner 315
James Holly Hanford. Coleridge as a Philologian 615
Hélène J. Harvitt. Hugues Salel, Poet and Translator . . . 595
Henry Barrett Hinckley. Chauceriana 39
James Root Hulbert. The Sources of *St. Erkenwald* and *The Trental of Gregory*. 485
T. Atkinson Jenkins. On Alleged Anglo-Normanisms in the Oxford *Roland* 569
Alexander Haggerty Krappe. Bertrand de Bar-sur-Aube and *Aymeri de Narbonne* 151
W. Kurrelmeyer. The Sources of Wieland's *Don Sylvio* . . . 637
Kemp Malone. The *A* of *Father, Rather* 11
Robert Grant Martin. A New Specimen of the Revenge Play . 1
Régis Michaud. Le Transcendantalisme d'après l'histoire . . 393
Olin H. Moore. The Infernal Council 169
Samuel Moore. New Life-Records of Chaucer 49

E. PROKOSCH. Die Indogermanische *Media Aspirata*. II, III, and IV . . . . . 99, 325, and 543

H. W. PUCKETT. The Fay, Particularly the Fairy Mistress, in Middle High German 297

HYDER E. ROLLINS. Martin Parker, Ballad-Monger 449

JAMES FINCH ROYSTER. A Note on French-English Word Pairs in Middle English 501

MARTIN SCHÜTZE. Studies in the Mind of Romanticism. I. Romantic Motives of Conduct in Concrete Development. . . 281 and 505

EDGAR FINLEY SHANNON. Chaucer and Lucan's *Pharsalia* . . . 609

DOROTHY LISTER SIMONS. The Individual Human Dramatis Personae of the *Divine Comedy* 371

HORATIO E. SMITH. Poe's Extension of His Theory of the Tale . . 195

FRANKLYN BLISS SNYDER. Notes on Burns's First Volume . . 475

EDWIN H. TUTTLE. Vowel-Breaking in Southern France . . . 585

LEONARD DE LONG WALLACE. A New Date for the *Conquest of Granada* 271

ERNEST WEEKLEY. "To Prune" and "to Prime" 431

CASIMIR DOUGLASS ZDANOWICZ. *Don Garcie* and *Le Misanthrope* . 129

REVIEWS AND NOTICES:

Adams: Shakespearean Playhouses. A History of English Theatres from the Beginnings to the Restoration (Baskervill) 503

Bates, ed.: A Woman Killed with Kindness and The Fair Maid of the West (by Thomas Heywood) (Adams) 273

Bowen: The Novels of Ferdinand Fabre (Dargan) . . . 607

Campbell, ed.: The Poems of Edgar Allen Poe (Sherburn) . . 56

Cook, ed.: A Literary Middle English Reader (Knott) . . . 277

Cortés: Casos Cervantinos que Tocan a Valladolid (Northup) . 167

Croll and Clemons, eds.: Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit; Euphues & his England (by John Lyly) (Baskervill) 279

Figueiredo: Characteristics of Portuguese Literature (Northup) . 608

———: Historia de Litteratura Classica (1502–1580) (Northup). 608

Fisher: The Mystic Vision in the Grail Legend and in the Divine Comedy (Nitze and Wilkins) 433

How (translator) and Wagner (ed.): The Life of Lazarillo de Tormes and His Fortunes and Adversities (Northup) . . 385

Meyer: Miscellanea Hibernica (Cross) 218

Orr, ed.: Les Œuvres de Guiot de Provins, poète lyrique et satirique (Jenkins) 391

Rosenberg, ed.: Comedia Famosa de Las Burlas Veras de Ivlian de Armendariz (Northup) 389

Scott: Elizabethan Translations from the Italian (Baskervill) . 213

Some War Novels with Soldiers as Heroes (Schinz) . . . 381

Van Tieghem: L'Année littéraire (1754–1790) comme intermédiare en France des littératures étrangères (Kessler) . . 223

———: Ossian en France (Cross) 439

ERRATA

MODERN PHILOLOGY, XVI (July, 1918), p. 155, line 15: *for* "Henry II" *read* "Erard de Brienne."

Vol. XVI, March, 1919, p. 591, line 9: for *equal* read *egual;* p. 593, line 3: for *n* read η.

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVI *May 1918* NUMBER 1

A NEW SPECIMEN OF THE REVENGE PLAY

Professor A. H. Thorndike, in his article, "The Relations of Hamlet to Contemporary Revenge Plays,"[1] and more recently in his volume entitled *Tragedy*,[2] analyzed the Elizabethan revenge play to educe its characteristics, and enumerated a series of plays concluding with the second quarto of *Hamlet* in which these characteristics appear. The list includes *The Spanish Tragedy* (1586–87), the old *Hamlet* (before Aug. 23, 1589), *Antonio's Revenge* (1599), the transitional *Hamlet* (1601–2; Q1, 1603), *Hoffman* (1602), *The Atheist's Tragedy* (1602–3), the final *Hamlet* (1603; Q2, 1604). My purpose is to add to the list another specimen of the type, the last two acts of Thomas Heywood's *The Iron Age*, Part 2,[3] which probably antedates all the above-mentioned plays except the first two. I shall make use of Thorndike's method of exposition, as follows:

I. A brief statement of the plot.
II. An examination of the leading motives and their treatment.
III. A consideration of the soliloquies.
IV. An examination of the scenes, situations, and details of the stage presentation.
V. A discussion of the characters.
VI. A discussion of the style.
VII. A discussion of the characteristics which differentiate this play from the others of the type.

[1] *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assn.*, XVII (1902), 125–220.

[2] Boston, 1908.

[3] In Heywood's *Collected Plays*, Pearson, London, 1874, vol. III; page references are to this edition.

Before stating the plot I must answer the question, How do you justify such an isolation of two acts of a play, and a consideration of them independent of their context? The answer is that the author himself has suggested such treatment by making the two acts a sort of appendix to the story of the Trojan War which occupies the first part of *The Iron Age* and the first three acts of the second part. In eight acts Heywood tells the story of the siege and fall of Troy, and then makes of the last two acts a little drama, practically complete in itself, dealing with the fortunes of the Greek heroes after their return to Greece. Its connection with the preceding part of the play lies in the fact that the revenge plot herein worked out is presented as the sequel of an episode that occurred during the siege. Synon, in his lying harangue to the Trojans[1] persuading them to admit the wooden horse within their walls, had referred to the death of a certain Palamedes. Caxton, whose *Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye*[2] is Heywood's main source for his *Ages*, tells the story thus.[3] Palamedes, son of Naulus, ruler of a kingdom in the south of Greece, grumbled against the lordship of Agamemnon over the Greek host. Agamemnon offered to resign the position, and at a council of the Greek leaders Palamedes was chosen commander-in-chief. He was shortly killed in battle, shot in the throat by an arrow from the bow of Paris. To his father Naulus was borne a false report that a charge of treason had been trumped up against Palamedes, and that he had been foully slain by Ulysses and Diomed.[4] Acting upon this erroneous information, Naulus and his surviving son Cethus plotted to draw the returning Greek fleet on the rocky shores of their kingdom and thus wreak vengeance upon the slayers of Palamedes. Although two hundred ships were so wrecked, all the leaders escaped, and Cethus was forced to other methods. He wrote to Clytemnestra a letter saying that Agamemnon had married one of Priam's daughters and was bringing her home to make her his queen. Clytemnestra incited her paramour Aegisthus to kill her husband on the night of his arrival, a murder afterwards avenged by Orestes. In like manner,

[1] *2 Iron Age*, II, i.

[2] Ed. H. Oskar Sommer, London, 1894.

[3] *Recuyell*, pp. 591, 616–18, 624–27, 677 ff.

[4] Cf. *2 Iron Age*, p. 397.

Cethus poisoned the mind of "Egee" (Aegiale), wife of Diomed, against her lord; in this case, however, a reconcilement was effected between husband and wife.

Upon this story Heywood bases the last two acts of his play, but with a divergence from Caxton's narrative so wide as to prompt curiosity concerning a possible model. He makes Cethus the ingenious plotter of a wholesale revenge embracing not only Agamemnon and Diomed, but all the returned Greeks except Ulysses. Adopting now Thorndike's method of analysis, we find the story of the two acts to be as follows.

I. Cethus, having learned of the safe arrival of Agamemnon and his companions, instigates Clytemnestra and Aegisthus to murder Agamemnon before he has opportunity to punish them for their adultery. Accordingly, when Agamemnon, at the conclusion of a banquet, retires to his bed-chamber, he is slain by the guilty pair, who flee to a stronghold for refuge. Roused by the cries of Agamemnon and by a thunder peal which shakes the palace, the other members of the royal household and the visiting kings rush in, to find Agamemnon dead; and Orestes, standing over the body, vows to take revenge on the murderers, whoever they may be. Cethus, however, already has under way another train of mischief. Before the return of the heroes, a betrothal had been arranged between Orestes and Hermione, daughter of Menelaus and Helen. Menelaus, ignorant of this arrangement, has promised Hermione to Pyrrhus, son of Achilles; the announcement of this disposition of Hermione, and the sight of Pyrrhus courting her, inflames Orestes against Pyrrhus, thus furnishing Cethus with "another column on which to build his slaughters."

Speedy vengeance falls upon Agamemnon's murderers. By a device of Cethus, Orestes and his friend Pylades, disguised as messengers, gain access to Clytemnestra and Aegisthus in their stronghold, and when Aegisthus proposes to the messengers that, as a measure of safety, they put Orestes out of the way, Orestes discovers himself and kills Aegisthus. Pylades goes out to win over the guard. Orestes, left alone with his mother, reproaches her in bitter terms, and when she protests her innocence, he invokes supernatural aid that he may know the truth. By the stage direction, "*Enter the*

Ghost of Agamemnon, *poynting unto his wounds: and then to* Egistus *and the Queene, who were his murderers; which done, hee vanisheth.*" On this testimony, Orestes kills his mother, to whom the ghost has been invisible.

The scene shifts to a temple where, attended by the Greek leaders, Pyrrhus and Hermione are being married. While the ceremony is in progress, Orestes, Pylades, and Cethus break in with drawn swords. Orestes falls on Pyrrhus, and Cethus whispers in the ear of Diomed something which causes him to attack Menelaus. Let a stage direction again speak for what occurs: "*A confused scuffle, in which* Orestes *kils* Pyrhus: Pyrhus, Orestes: Cethus *wounds* Pillades, Diomed, Menelaus, Ulisses, Thersites, &c. *All fall dead save* Ulisses, *who beareth thence* Hermione: *Which done,* Cethus *riseth up from the dead bodies, and speakes.*" Cethus, in almost comic fashion, taunts his victims as they lie heaped before the altar, including Synon; but here he reckons without his host, for Synon, rising from among the dead, challenges Cethus to fight for the title of arch-villain, and they kill each other. The play is brought to a conclusion by the death of Helen, who, after an apostrophe to her fatal beauty as she gazes in a mirror, strangles herself, and by an epilogue by Ulysses, the sole survivor.

II. The motives indicated by Thorndike as characteristic of the revenge play are all present in this plot. (1) Revenge, in this case of a triple kind: of brother for brother; of a son for his father, directed by the father's ghost; of a slighted lover upon his successful rival. (2) Hesitation: seen in the irresolution of Orestes before he kills Clytemnestra, his doubt being dispelled by the testimony of the ghost. (3) Madness: after the death of Clytemnestra Orestes breaks out into a raving description of his future in Hades:

> There is a *Plasma*, or deepe pit
> Just in the Center fixt for Parricides;
> I'l keepe my Court there, and *Erinnis*, shee
> In stead of *Hebe*, shall attend my cup;
> *Charon*, the Ferri-man of Hell shall bee
> My *Ganimed*. . . . . .
> I'le have a guard of Furies which shall light mee
> Unto my nuptiall bed with funerall Teades;
> The fatall sisters shall my hand-maides bee,
> And waite upon the faire *Hermione*.[1]

[1] P. 424.

Pylades remarks, "The Prince is sure distracted," but Cethus recalls Orestes from his brain-storm by reminding him that his vengeance on Pyrrhus is yet to come. (4) Intrigue is profusely practised: by Cethus in his plots of incensing the various leaders against one another and in his plan for the disguise of Orestes; by Orestes in the manner by which he gains access to Aegisthus, and by Aegisthus in his effort to have Orestes put out of the way—intrigue both by and against the avenger. (5) The bloody character of the play: there are twelve deaths in the two acts, as opposed to ten in *The Spanish Tragedy*, six in *Hamlet*, six in *Antonio's Revenge*, seven in *Hoffman*, seven in *The Atheist's Tragedy;* the concluding massacre results in a depopulation of the stage perhaps more sweeping than in any other scene of carnage in Elizabethan drama. (6) The enforcement of the main situation by others of a similar nature is illustrated by the tripling of the revenge motive as shown in (1). (7) The unlawful passion of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra parallels the relations between Claudius and Gertrude, and suggests the passion of Piero for Maria in *Antonio's Revenge*, of Hoffman for Martha in *Hoffman*,[1] of D'Amville for Castabella in *The Atheist's Tragedy*.

III. As in the plays cited by Thorndike, soliloquies play an important part. Cethus has six:

> With wondrous joy, they say, the Greekes return (p. 396).
> Doe, doe, contract and marry, ayme at Heaven (p. 397).
> Now, father, stile me a most worthy sonne (p. 404).
> My brayne, about againe, for thou hast found (p. 408).
> And 'tis a fruitfull yeare for villany (p. 417).
> What, all asleepe? and are these gossiping tongues (p. 427).

and Helen one:

> Was this wrinkled forehead,
> When 'twas at best, worth halfe so many lives? (p. 429).

These soliloquies, however, with the exception of Helen's, are not of the moralizing, philosophical sort found in all the other plays but *Hoffman*. Helen's is, to be sure, the most striking and effective

[1] References to *Hoffman* are on Thorndike's authority, since I have no text of the play at hand.

of the lot, with its echo of Faustus' famous apostrophe;[1] its reflective nature and melancholy tone bring it into exact correspondence with the typical revenge play soliloquy. Cethus' opening speech, in which he contrasts his sorrow with the joy over the return of the Greek host, and reproaches himself for cowardice and sloth in the performance of his revenge, inevitably reminds us of Hamlet's mood in "O what a rogue and peasant slave am I!" The others are more like those in *Hoffman*, explaining Cethus' stratagems and bragging of his exploits; the last, in particular, addressed to the dead, is a typical specimen of rhodomontade.

IV. Of the individual scenes and situations many are of the sort found in the revenge type of play. The tentative love scenes between Orestes and Hermione, and Pyrrhus and Hermione, correspond to the sentimental element in *The Spanish Tragedy*, the Lodowick-Lucibella scene in *Hoffman*, the Charlemont-Castabella scene in *The Atheist's Tragedy*. Agamemnon's murder recalls in several details commonplaces of the revenge play. It occurs after a carousing banquet, reminding us of similar revelry in *The Spanish Tragedy*, *Fratricide Punished*, *Hamlet*, and *Antonio's Revenge*. Agamemnon, while chatting with Clytemnestra, is struck with a premonition of evil; such a foreboding is, of course, common enough in Elizabethan tragedy, and, as a matter of fact, it is the avenger who experiences it in *Fratricide Punished*, *Hamlet*, and *Hoffman*. One of the king's exclamations at this point, with its mention of graves and winding sheets,[2] recalls the fondness for graveyard scenes, the exhibitions of skulls and bones, and the frequent references to charnel-house accessories in all tragedies of blood. When the murderers wound Agamemnon, "a greate thunder crack" shakes the palace; in *Fratricide Punished* lightning accompanies the entrance of the ghost,

[1] *Dr. Faustus:*

> Was this the face that launch'd a thousand ships,
> And burnt the topless towers of Ilium?

Cf. *2 Iron Age*, p. 430:

> Where is that beauty? lives it in this face
> Which hath set two parts of the World at warre,
> Been ruine of the *Asian* monarchy,
> And almost this of *Europe*? this the beauty
> That launch'd a thousand ships from *Aulis* gulfe?

[2] How hard this Doune feeles, like a monument
Cut out of marble. Beds resemble Graves,
And these, me-thinkes, appeare like winding-sheetes,
Prepar'd for corses [p. 412].

Hoffman's opening soliloquy is punctuated by thunder and lightning, and in *The Atheist's Tragedy* thunder and lightning precede the ghost's appearance. Orestes, over the body of his father, vows vengeance as does Hieronimo over Horatio's corpse. Finally, the fourth act ends with a solemn funeral procession like those in *The Spanish Tragedy, Fratricide Punished, Hamlet, Hoffman,* and, for that matter, in most Elizabethan tragedies.

Most interesting, because it at once suggests one of the most familiar situations in *Hamlet,* is the scene between Orestes and his mother, at which the ghost appears. Koeppel[1] pointed out the resemblance between the two scenes, though he might have extended his comparison to include another similarity: when Clytemnestra laments Aegisthus' death, Orestes apostrophizes Agamemnon and reviles Aegisthus in a manner that recalls the portraits speech.[2] As in *Hamlet*[3] the ghost is invisible to the woman, and she concludes, from her son's wild behavior and inquiries whether she sees nothing, that he is mad. The differences are obvious: Orestes has already killed Aegisthus, Hamlet has Claudius yet to kill; the ghost silently encourages Orestes to kill Clytemnestra, where the ghost of old Hamlet expressly commands the prince to do his mother no harm. Heywood's conduct of the scene resembles that in the *Hamlet* group more closely than does any other of the series. In *The Spanish Tragedy* the ghost is a mere spectator; in *Antonio's Revenge* the ghost is visible to the mother and speaks to her, but she arrives at the same conclusion that her son is mad; in *Hoffman* there is no ghost; in *The Atheist's Tragedy* the ghost appears only to the avenger, to the villain, and to a soldier.

Minor details which are found in other revenge plays are: a comic element, supplied by the deformed railers Thersites and Synon; use of disguise by the avengers; a marriage pageant;[4] the suicide of Helen.[5] "Awake, revenge, Ile bring thee now to action,"

[1] *Studien über Shakespeare's Wirkung auf Zeitgenössische Dramatiker* (Bang's *Materialien zur Kunde des älteren Englischen Dramas,* Vol. IX, 1905), p. 25.

[2] The portraits incident is also suggested in *Fratricide Punished.*

[3] And in *Fratricide Punished.*

[4] Cf. *Antonio's Revenge* and *The Atheist's Tragedy.*

[5] Cf. the suicide of Ophelia, of Isabella in *The Spanish Tragedy,* and of Levidulcia in *The Atheist's Tragedy.*

cries Cethus,[1] recalling the "vindicta" of Hieronimo and Antonio, and more distantly, the "Hamlet, revenge" and "Antonio, Revenge" of the ghosts in the old *Hamlet* and *Antonio's Revenge*. The wholesale character of the final massacre is most closely approached by the slaughter at the end of *The Spanish Tragedy*.

V. For the characterization not a great deal can be said; it is either lacking or almost purely conventional. Heywood's failure to make his characters more individual and lifelike is due partly to the limited opportunity afforded by the two-act space of his drama in miniature, partly to the fact that emphasis, all the way through the *Ages*, is laid almost altogether upon event. The two avengers, as is usually the case with the type in the revenge plays, stand out most distinctly. Cethus combines the functions of avenger and villain. He is resourceful, cunning, and cruel, and his determination to spare no one in any way connected with the supposed slayers of Palamedes surpasses even Hoffman's sweeping designs. His character has no depth, nor has he any of the philosophy common in his kind. He indulges in some rant, like Hieronimo, the early Hamlet, and the heroes of Marston and Tourneur, and vaunts his deeds much in the manner of Hoffman. The touch of irony frequent in his speeches[2] allies him with Hieronimo, Hamlet, and Hoffman. Orestes is more sympathetically presented; he is more imaginative than Cethus—Cethus is too cool to get to the verge of madness as does Orestes—more passionate; more phases of his character are displayed, since he is lover and son as well as avenger. Pylades plays to him the part that Horatio does to Hamlet. Helen's speech lends to her death an unexpected dignity; the mirror business is perhaps, as Koeppel suggests,[3] to be attributed to Ovid.[4]

VI. The style is undistinguished—fluent, but not, save in a few passages, marked by imaginative power. When *The Iron Age* was printed in 1632 Heywood prefaced to the second part an address to the reader in which he apologized for the old-fashioned quality of his

[1] P. 396.

[2] E.g., pp. 397, 398, and his last soliloquy, p. 427.

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 25.

[4] *Met.* xv. 231–32. Koeppel also compares with the opening lines of Helen's speech, *Richard II*, IV, i, 283–84:

> Was this the face
> That, like the sun, did make beholders wink?

work: "These Ages have been long since Writ, and suited with the Time then: I know not how they may be received in this Age."[1] One of Heywood's characteristic touches of homely tenderness occurs when Agamemnon, making ready for bed just before he is killed, inquires of Clytemnestra after the progress of their children while he has been absent at Troy.[2] It may be worth noting that some scurrilous couplets of Synon's[3] are repeated in Heywood's *Gunaikeion, or Nine Books of Various History concerning Women*,[4] where they are attributed to Ovid's *De Arte Amandi*, bk. ii.[5]

VII. It would perhaps be a bit unreasonable to expect so brief a drama to make a distinctive contribution to the development of the revenge play. It simply furnishes another illustration of the influence of *The Spanish Tragedy* and the original *Hamlet*, containing all the important motives and features of its type, save the element of Senecan philosophy. In itself it is workmanly, displaying the honest craftsmanship and feeling for theatrical effect which we expect from Heywood. In unity and coherence it is distinctly the best work that Heywood does in the *Ages*, although it must be admitted that the "confused scuffle" of the last scene is cheap and noisy in its effort to impress by mere weight of numbers, and that the combat between Cethus and Synon is a ludicrous anticlimax. The improvement over Caxton's rambling narrative and scattered ending is unquestionable.

[1] P. 351.

[2] Aga. You told me, Queene,
Orestes was a cunning horse-man growne:
It pleasde me much to heare it.
Cli. *Greece* reports
No Centare can ride better.
Aga. And young *Electra*,
In all th' indowments that may best become
A Princesse of her breeding, most compleate.
Cli. It was in your long absence, all my care
(Being my charge) that you at your returne
Might finde them to your wishes.
Aga. Thankes for that [p. 411].

[3] P. 415.

[4] London, 1624, p. 264.

[5] Ll. 711–16. These are doubtless from that version of three books of *De Arte Amandi* and two of *De Remedio Amoris* of which Heywood speaks in the preface to the *Brazen Age;* he complains that they had been stolen from him by one Austin, a pedagogue of Ham. Professor J. S. P. Tatlock, in his article, "The Siege of Troy in Elizabethan Literature," *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assn.*, XXX (1915), 715, calls attention to a similar use in *1 Iron Age* of parts of Ovid's *Heroides* given more at length in *Troia Britannica*.

Enough evidence has been presented to prove the main contention. The question of date remains to be considered. From the similarity of the ghost scene to that in *Hamlet*, Koeppel draws the conclusion, as does Professor Bradley,[1] that Heywood was imitating Shakspere. Now, in any case, this conclusion is not inevitable, since there is nothing in Heywood which could not have been suggested by the old *Hamlet*, as represented by the *Fratricide Punished*, as well as by the second quarto form.[2] Furthermore, the probability is that *The Iron Age* was on the stage before Shakspere began work on the Hamlet story. All the evidence for this view has been ably presented by Professor Tatlock, whose final conclusion is that the *Ages* were written 1594–96.[3] If this be the case, Heywood's work antedates by some time the period of the revenge play's greatest popularity, 1597–1604. There remains the possibility that specific likenesses between *The Iron Age* and *Hamlet* may be due to revision by Heywood, a theory which the appendix-like character of these two acts might render more plausible; but of such possible revision I can find no indication.

ROBERT GRANT MARTIN

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

[1] *Shakespearean Tragedy*, London, 1905, p. 140, note.

[2] Professor Tatlock (*op. cit.*, p. 719, footnote 47) makes this contention for the ghost scene. I thoroughly agree with Tatlock in dissenting from the convincingness of Bradley's parallels between *Hamlet* and *2 Iron Age* (*Shakespearean Tragedy*, p. 419).

[3] *Op. cit.*, pp. 705–19. Whether *The Iron Age* was written before the other three *Ages* is unessential here; if, as Tatlock thinks, *The Iron Age* came first, so much the better for my theory.

THE *A* OF *FATHER, RATHER*

That a long as well as a short *a* was heard in ME *father, rather* is attested by the PE dialectal forms *fayther, rayther,* etc. This long *a* is usually explained as being a result of the general ME tendency to lengthen short vowels in open syllables. However, if we leave *father, rather* out of consideration, words in *-ther* certainly show no signs of having been influenced by such a tendency. On the contrary, the termination *-ther* not only succeeded in keeping a preceding *short* vowel short; it even made a preceding *long* vowel short, as in *lather, mother,* etc. The current explanation is therefore clearly somewhat unsatisfactory, to say the least, and the present paper is an attempt to solve the problem on the basis of an entirely different theory.

Our difficulties are apparently increased (though in reality diminished, as will presently appear) by the fact that neither in the dialects nor in StE have *father* and *rather* developed along scrupulously parallel lines. So far as the dialects are concerned, the following table, based on the material collected in Wright's *Dialect Dictionary,* may serve to indicate the nature and extent of the divergencies. The table is meant to be complete so far as the material at my disposition would allow; the phonetic symbols used are taken from Wright, without change.

	father	*rather*
Scotland, by geographical divisions		
North-East	a, ā, e, ē	ė
North-West	ē	.....
South-North	a, ā	ē
East-Mid	ǣ, ė	ē
West-Mid	ē	ė
South-Mid	a, e, ē	.....
South	ė	ė, ē
Scotland, by administrative divisions		
Shetlands	ǣ, e, ē	e
Orkneys	e	e
Caithness	ē	.....
Inverness	a	.....
Buchan	ā	ė

	father	*rather*
Scotland (administrative divisions)—*Continued*		
Aberdeen	ā	ė
West Forfor	ā	ē
East Perth	ā	ē
Ayr	.....	ē
Lothian	æ, ē	.....
Kirkcudbright	.....	ē
Ireland		
Ulster		
In general	ə	ə
Antrim	e	e
England and Wales		
Northumberland		
North-Northeast	e	.....
Mid-East	ā, ē	ē
South-East	e, ē	e, ē
South-West	a	eə
South	a, e	e
Durham		
North	a, e, ē, i, iə	.....
South	a	ē
Cumberland		
North	a, æ, e	eə, ē
East	a	.....
Mid	a	ē
West	a	.....
Westmoreland	a	ē
Yorkshire		
North-Northwest	a	ā, ē
South-Northwest	a	ē
North-East	ā	eə, ē
North-Mid	a, iə	.....
Mid	iə	eə, iə
East	a, ē	eə
South-East	a, ē	eə, ē, iə
Mid-South	a, eə, ē, ā	.....
East-South	ē	.....
North	.....	eə
South	a	.....
South-West	a, ē	eə
Lancashire		
North-West	a	eə, ē
North	a	ē
Mid	a	ē
East-Mid	ē	ē
South-Mid	a, ē	ē
Mid-South	.....	ē
South-West	ē	ē
South	ē	ē
South-East	ei	ē
Isle of Man	ā	a

	father	*rather*
England and Wales—*Continued*		
Cheshire		
West	ī	.....
Mid	ē, ī	.....
South	ā, ē, ī	ē, ī
Flintshire	ē, ī	ē
Denbighshire	ē	.....
Staffordshire		
North	ei, ē	ei
East	ē	.....
East-Mid	ei, ē	.....
West-Mid	ē	.....
South	eə, ē, iə	o
Derbyshire		
In general	ē	.....
North-West	.....	ǣ
North	.....	ē
East	.....	ǣ
Nottinghamshire	ā, ē	.....
Lincolnshire		
North-West	ei, eə	eə
North	eə, ē	ā, ē
Mid	a, eə	ē
South	eə	eə, ē
Rutlandshire	ā, ē	a, ē
Leicestershire		
In general	ā, ē	e, ē, o
North	eə	.....
Northamptonshire		
North-East	ā	.....
Mid	ā, iə, ē	e
South-West	ā	.....
Warwickshire		
East	ē, iə	ǣ, e
West	ē, iə	iə
South	ā, eə	.....
Worcestershire		
North	eə, ē	.....
South	ē, iə	.....
East	.....	e
Shropshire		
North	ē	ē
North-East	ē, ī	e
Mid	a, ē	.....
South-East	ǣ, ē	.....
Herefordshire		
North	ē	.....
East	ē	.....
Pembrokeshire		
South	ē	.....
Gloucestershire	ǣ, ā, iə	.....

	father	*rather*
England and Wales—*Continued*		
Oxfordshire		
North-West	iə	.....
West	ā	ǣ
East	ā	e
Mid	.....	e
South	ā	ɐ
Buckinghamshire		
In general	.....	ē
North	ā, ē	.....
Mid	æ, ē, iə	.....
Bedfordshire	a, ā	ā
Hertfordshire	ā	.....
Huntingdonshire	ā	.....
Cambridgeshire	.....	ē
Norfolk		
In general	ā	.....
North-East	.....	æ, ē
Suffolk		
East	ā	ɐ
West	a	.....
Essex	ā	ē
Kent		
North	ā	.....
East	.....	ē
South-East	ā	ā
Surrey		
South	.....	ā, ē
Sussex		
East	eə, iə	ē
West	.....	ā, ē
Hampshire		
South-Mid	iə	.....
Isle of Wight	ē	.....
Wiltshire		
North-West	ē	.....
West	ǣ, iə	.....
Mid-East	æ	ǣ
Dorsetshire		
In general	æ	ǣ
East	ā, ǣ, ē	.....
Somersetshire		
In general	ā	.....
North-West	ē	ē
East	a	.....
Devonshire		
In general	ā	.....
North	ā	ē
East	.....	eə
South-West	.....	ɐ

In standard speech *father* is now universally pronounced with a long vowel—[a·]. The origin of this [a·] is as obscure as is the origin of the ME long. Jespersen, *Mod. Eng. Gram.*, I, 10.67, advances the theory that the present sound goes back to ME [a·]. For a discussion of this theory see W. Horn, *Anglia*, XXXV, 364 ff. Other scholars apparently derive it from an early eighteenth-century [æ·], a sound which in its turn had developed (by lengthening) out of an older short *a*. Thus Horn, *loc. cit.*, though he introduces the suggestion cautiously enough (p. 374): "Vielleicht ist aber die möglichkeit doch nicht ganz von der hand zu weisen." It is of course true that short *a* was regularly lengthened before [f, þ, s]. There are exceptions even here, however, and when we come to the corresponding voiced spirants we find ourselves on uncertain ground indeed. Such forms as *paths* can hardly be brought forward as evidence, and *raspberry*, with its voiced *s*, is clearly not a case in point. There remain the words in *-ther*, and here, if we assume that there really was a tendency to lengthen a short *a* before [ð], the inconsistencies of present usage are inexplicable. Why did the long sound establish itself completely in *father*, but only partially in *rather* and not at all in *gather*, *lather?*

If it were analogy we were dealing with, these inconsistencies would not trouble us to the same extent. The workings of analogy are rarely thoroughgoing. Tradition may be brought to bay, but the dogs do not escape with whole skins. Thus, even so mighty an instrument of analogy as the English plural in *-s* has never been able to uproot the *-n* of *oxen* or add an *s* to *sheep*. Furthermore, the ways of analogy are often inscrutable. Why, for instance, do we have analogical stress in *deplorable*, *remarkable*, but not in *(ir)revocable*, *admirable*, *comparable?* Or why did analogy drive the [g] out of *singer*, but not out of *younger?* Examples might be multiplied indefinitely, but what I have given will suffice to show that analogy sometimes moves in an inconsistent way its changes to perform.

It is my purpose to show that the [a·] of *father*, *rather* first developed in *father*, and thence spread, by analogy, to *rather*. If we accept Jespersen's theories as to PE [a·], we may suppose that the [a·] under discussion established itself once for all in ME times. If we adhere to the [æ· > a·] hypothesis (which will be my working basis in

the following discussion), we must look upon the ME and the eighteenth-century lengthenings as mutually independent developments, the parallelism of which is due to the fact that in each case the same principle of phonetic change was at work. What this principle was becomes obvious enough when we read Granville Sharp's *A Short Treatise on the English Tongue* (London, 1767). Sharp is an orthoëpist who, so far as I am aware, has never got a hearing in Anglistic circles. I hope to be able to bring out at some future time a complete analysis of his pronunciation, on the basis of the *Treatise* named above. Here, however, I shall deal primarily with his statements concerning the pronunciation of the letter *a*.

Sharp calls long *a* (i.e., the *a* of *fate*, etc.) "the English *a*," because this value of the letter seems peculiar to English. Similarly with *e* and *i*. On page 3 he gives the following rule: "The English (or long) sound is given to the vowels *a*, *e*, and *i* . . . . when they are alone, or when there is not a consonant following them in the same syllable. . . . ." On page 5 we find exceptions to this rule: "Except . . . . in *Fa-ther*, and the last syllable of *Pa-pa*, *Mam-ma*, wherein it has a medium sound between *aw* and the English *a*. . . . ." This "medium sound" was clearly either [æ·] or [a·], presumably the latter, since the words in question are listed under *a*=*aw* in the index. However, the exact quality of the vowel need not concern us at this point. Just now we are interested primarily in Sharp's *identification* of the three *a*'s. This identification we find also in such good authorities as Sheridan (1780), Nares (1784), and Walker (1791), so that we are thoroughly justified in assuming the correctness of Sharp's statement. The next step, therefore, is to look into the history of *father*, *mamma*, *papa* to see if we can discover some explanation for the parallelism of their development.

Mamma occurs twice in sixteenth-century monuments (Eden, 1555, *Decades*, p. 44; Lyly, 1579, *Euphues*, ed. *Arber.*, p. 129), but thereafter it disappears from the literary language for over a century (*NED*). Its restoration (*ca.* 1680) to standard speech is usually attributed to French influence, and this explanation is supported by the fact that the literary word, from the time of its revival to the present day, has always had ultima stress (*NED*). It may even be argued that not only the stress but the whole word may have been

borrowed from the French. The final vowel would in that case of course have lost its nasalization in the mouths of English children, and would have become a wide [ɔ·] to begin with, since *aw*[1] was in those days the regular substitution for French (and German) *a*. The existence of such a pronunciation is directly attested by Shadwell's rhyme *mamma : awe* (*NED*), and by the PE vulgar *paw, maw*, formerly in widespread use and frequently heard to this day (in the United States at least). However, we need not assume a French origin for this [ɒ·]. A native word *mama*, even if it had never before existed, might have been created any day in the nursery, and the stressed vowel of a seventeenth-century nursery-made or -remodeled *mama* would have been [ɒ·] or [æ·] rather than [a·]. The open vowels baby produces are usually more like [a] than anything else, it is true, but the important thing is not what baby says (the fact of the matter is, he doesn't say anything; he merely makes meaningless noises[2]), but what the fond parents think he says. Baby's noises are therefore always interpreted in terms of the parents' sound system, modified by the influence of tradition. Thus the traditional labials expected—and consequently heard—are *p* and *m*. We do not hear *b* because there was no initial *b* in Indo-European. Furthermore, since there was no such sound as [a, a·] in late seventeenth-century and early eighteenth-century English, baby's open vowels were interpreted as [æ] in South Carolina nurseries (whence the present-day South Carolina forms [pæ, mæ][3]), but elsewhere, apparently, as [ɒ·]. This [ɒ·] developed also in *father*, as attested by Jones, 1701 (Ekwall's reprint, p. 29),[4] König's *Wegweiser*, 1706 (Driedger, p. 51), and König's *Grammatica*, 1715 (Driedger, *loc. cit.*). That is to say, baby's *fa-fa-fa*, etc., was interpreted as [fɒ·], largely, no doubt, because of the powerful analogy of (*pa*)*pa*, (*mam*)*ma*. The reverse process (i.e., the influence of the [æ] of *father* on the vowel of

[1] See almost any orthoëpist of the period; further, cf. PE vulgar [vɔ·z] *vase* (a pronunciation formerly in excellent standing—regularly used by Ellis, for instance), the proper names *Chicago, Arkansas*, the phrase *with a claw*, vulgar for *with éclat* (Jespersen, I, 9.96), and the word *mardigras* [ma·digrɔ·] 'carnival' (current in the southern part of the United States).

[2] Cf. Jespersen's *Børnesproget*.

[3] See Sylvester Primer, *Phonetische Studien*, I (1888), 235.

[4] Jones says "*father*, &c." I take the "&c" to mean *mamma, papa*. Neither of these words is equipped with a *th*, it is true, but this means only that Jones has bungled things—as usual. See further Ekwall's Introduction, § 98.

ma, pa) may partly account for the South Carolina development; certainly the analogy of the short vowel in *fa-* must have been the decisive factor in the development of [æ] rather than [æ·] in the other two words. I may add that I have rarely heard the [æ] of *pa, ma* pronounced as a genuine short vowel; it is usually half-long, I should say.

The use of a short or half-long [æ] in words of this character is not unknown to StE; witness *dad, daddy, mammy*. Of the particular words under consideration, however, only *father* can be shown to have possessed a short *a* in standard eighteenth-century speech, and this short *a* goes back, of course, to pre-Germanic times. Even for *father*, indeed, the evidence is perhaps not quite conclusive. The most definite thing I have been able to find is contained, unfortunately enough, in Theodor Arnold's (1736) *Grammatica Anglicana Concentrata*, one of the most unsatisfactory grammars ever compiled. Arnold's work contains, among other things, "phonetic" transcriptions of the Lord's Prayer, the Gloria, etc. In the passages transcribed the word *father* occurs eight times; in every case it is respelled *fäther*. This seems definite enough, but as a matter of fact the symbol *ä* is ambiguous; Arnold often uses it to indicate the *a* of *face*, etc., though his usual symbol for that sound is *äh*. To make matters worse, the plural *fathers*, which occurs once in the passages transcribed, is respelled with *a* instead of *ä*. Here, however, we may safely assume, I think, that the failure of the umlaut sign to appear was due simply to an oversight. It is also highly improbable that Arnold was familiar with the dialectal *faythe*r—his grammar was "made in Germany," and certainly reveals no intimate acquaintance with English pronunciation—so on the whole *fäther* may safely be taken at its face value.

We have seen that baby's open vowels were interpreted as [æ] in South Carolina. They might perhaps even better have been interpreted as [æ·], however, and there is some evidence that this interpretation of them actually took place in StE. Sheridan's 1780 $\overset{1}{a}$ in $\overset{1}{father}$, $\overset{1}{papa}$, $\overset{1}{mamma}$ must have been a long vowel (Ellis labels it ææ), and Buchanan (1766) records the same sound for *father*, if Ellis' lists are to be trusted. What Sheridan says is worth giving in full; I quote from page 59 of his *Rhetorical Grammar* ("prefixed" to his

General Dictionary of the English Language). He says: "When the vowel, *a*, finishes a syllable, and has the accent on it, it is invariably pronounced $\overset{2}{a}$ (day) by the English. To this rule there are but three exceptions in the whole language, to be found in the words, *$\overset{1}{f}$ather*, *papa*, *mama*. The Irish may think also the word *rather* an exception . . . . but in the English pronunciation the consonant, th, is taken into the first syllable, as thus, *rath'-er*, which makes the difference." Sheridan distinguishes three *a*-sounds: $\overset{1}{a}$ (as in *fat*), $\overset{2}{a}$ (as in *fate*), and $\overset{3}{a}$ (as in *fall*). He indicates *shortness* (in a stressed syllable) by putting the stress mark after the following consonant instead of after the vowel itself. Here he makes it perfectly clear that *father* and *rather* are not to be pronounced alike, and since he nevertheless gives them both with $\overset{1}{a}$ there seems to be no escape from the conclusion that the *a* in the stressed syllable of *father*, *papa*, *mamma* was for him a lengthened [æ].

This is perhaps the best place to discuss J. B. Rogler's edition (1784) of Arnold's *Vollständig kleines Wörterbuch, Englisch und Deutsch.* I use Rogler rather than Arnold (1761) or Klausing's Arnold (1771) because the last two respell only a certain proportion of the words they give, while Rogler respells every word listed. All three dictionaries—or rather editions—exhibit the same peculiarity, viz., an astounding inconsistency in their respellings. Here are a few examples from Rogler; the respellings are inclosed in round brackets: *father* (*fahther*), *mamma* (*mämmäh*), *papa* (*pähpä*); *palm* (*pahm*), *psalm* (*sähm*), *balm* (*bähm*), *calm* (*kahm*); *half* (*hahf*), *halve* (*hähv*); *large* (*lahrdsch*), *barge* (*bährdsch*); *master* (*mähst'r*), *plaster* (*plässt'r*); *far* (*fähr*), *tar* (*tärr*); *haunch* (*hänntsch*), *launch* (*lahntsch*). All this can have but one meaning (for we have here something worse than mere muddling). The sound-change [æ·>a·] was at that time evidently in full course, bringing in its train a diversity of usage which must have bewildered our lexicographers. As to *father*, *mamma*, *papa*, the shift of stress in *papa* was not uncommon in the eighteenth century (see the *NED*). The *äh* of *papa*, *mamma* confirms Sheridan, and the contrasted *ah* of *father* is only typical of the general confusion which then prevailed.

We are now in a position to explain the origin of the PE [a·] in our three words. The basis was the Shadwell-Jones [ɒ·], which (to

judge from Sheridan and Buchanan) had undergone, in some nurseries at least, a remodeling to [æ·]. It is reasonably certain that a third pronunciation, with [æ], existed in *father*, and, in view of present South Carolina usage, this pronunciation may perhaps be assumed also for *mamma, papa*. The various pronunciations in question, all current at the same time, must have made usage unsettled and thus facilitated the general leveling which took place in the second half of the century. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the three *a*'s under discussion are not theoretical creations of mine; they are all recorded in our monuments, or in present usage, or in both, and the fact of their actual existence in the mouths of eighteenth-century speakers cannot successfully be challenged. Of the three, [æ·] would develop phonetically to [a·]; the other two either were simply leveled under this [a·] or else underwent nursery-remodeling, a process which would give the same result. For it is obvious enough that the normal form the nursery variety of the words would take is the form with [a·]. The development of this form had hitherto been hindered by the non-existence in standard speech of such a sound as [a·], but after the sound-change [æ· > a·] had begun, this hindrance was removed, the natural tendencies were given free play, and results quickly followed. The first *beleg* I have been able to find is that recorded in Theodor Arnold's *Vollständiges Englisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch* (Leipzig und Züllichau, 1761). Arnold's respelling for *father* is *fahther;* his respelling for *rather* is, on the other hand, *rätther*. The same respellings are given in the edition of 1771 (edited by A. E. Klausing) and in the abridged edition of 1784 (Rogler's *Kleines Wörterbuch*, discussed above). These transcriptions of *father* are to be compared with our same Arnold's *fäther* in 1736 (see above). Of the native orthoëpists I have already cited Sharp (1767). According to Nares (1784) *a* was pronounced [a·] in *mamma, papa, father, rath*, etc. (to mention only those words pertinent here). "Not so," he adds (p. 6) in a note to *rath*, "its derivative *rather*." As he has nothing further to say on the subject we are left in doubt as to whether his *a* in *rather* was [æ] or [e·]. Fortunately enough, though, Walker clears up the matter for us in a note appended to the article on *rather* in his *Critical Pronouncing Dictionary of the English Language* (I am using the edition of 1797).

He says: "Some very respectable speakers pronounce this word with the first syllable like that in *Rā-ven;* and Mr. Nares has adopted this pronunciation. Dr. Ash and Bailey seem to be of the same opinion; but all the other orthoëpists, from whom we can certainly know the quantity of the vowel, as Mr. Sheridan, Mr. Elphinston, Mr. Scott, Dr. Kendrick, W. Johnston, Mr. Perry, Buchanan, and Entick, make it short." He himself gives both pronunciations, indicating his preference by putting the [æ]-form first. He knows only [a·], however, in *father, mamma, papa.* This distinction between *father* and *rather* is maintained far into the nineteenth century. The following table, based partly on the variant pronunciations of *rather* recorded in Noah Webster's dictionary (London editions of 1831 and 1864), may serve to indicate the situation for the greater part of the century. The works listed are all dictionaries. The works are referred to by giving names of editors and dates of publication. The two American dictionaries, Webster's and Worcester's, are not listed; both of these, of course, give *rather* with [æ], which is still the usual American pronunciation.

1. [æ]: W. Perry, 1802 and 1805
   W. Scott, 1815
   G. Fulton and G. Knight, 1802 and 1833
   J. Walker, 1806 and 1826 (preferred pronunciation)
   Davenport's Walker, 1831 (preferred pronunciation)
   Smart's Walker, 1857
   A. J. Cooley, 1863
2. [e·]: S. Jones, 1806
   J. Walker, 1806 and 1826 (alternative pronunciation)
   Davenport's Walker, 1831 (alternative pronunciation)
3. [a·]: J. Jameson, 1827
   J. Knowles, 1835
   R. S. Jameson, 1850
   R. Cull, 1864

Although this list includes all the dictionaries I have access to, it is of course not exhaustive, and an earlier [a·]-*beleg* may some day be unearthed. There seems to be no doubt, however, that the [a·] of *rather* is, in marked contrast to that of *father,* a strictly nineteenth-century product, and as such it can be explained only as an analogical development. The analogy failed to establish itself in America

because it did not have sufficient support; if we leave out of consideration the region east of the Connecticut River, [a·] does not occur in American English except in foreign words, in interjections, in the words *father, papa, mamma,* before *r,* and before the bilabial consonant [m]. In England, however, where the sound is used much more widely, occurring even before [ð] in such plurals as *paths,* the analogical form, after a half-century or more of wavering, finally superseded the historical one. For Scotland see *NED.* Wyld's pronunciation of *lather* with [a·] indicates that this word is now coming under the influence of the same analogy.

I conceive the ME long forms to have originated in a similar way. Once introduced, the long seems to have completely driven out the short in the case of *rather* (except, of course, in the standard dialect). Only two modern dialects, those of Rutlandshire and the Isle of Man, use a vowel which can be derived from the ME short, and even here we probably have borrowing from StE. Not so with *father,* the pronunciation of which was liable to be affected by nursery influences. When long *a* became a front vowel the nursery began to look with favor upon the hitherto neglected short, which thereupon quickly regained currency in those dialects (including Standard English) which as yet had not completely discarded it. The influence of neighboring dialects, and especially of standard speech, must also have played a part from the very beginning; indeed, some of the variants we get are explainable only as borrowings. To sum up: the PE dialectal equivalents of the *a* of *rather* represent in most cases ME long *a,* in the remaining cases either a sound developed by analogy or else a sound borrowed from another dialect (usually Standard English); the PE dialectal equivalents of the *a* of *father* represent in many cases ME long or short *a* unmodified by nursery influences, in many cases ME long or short *a* modified by nursery influences, in the remaining cases a sound borrowed from Standard English or some other dialect.

KEMP MALONE

OTTENDORFER FELLOW
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

SPENSER'S TWELVE MORAL VIRTUES "ACCORDING TO ARISTOTLE"

An article by Ambassador Jusserand, entitled "Spenser's 'Twelve Private Morall Vertues as Aristotle hath Devised,'" *Modern Philology*, January, 1906, is my apology for writing. M. Jusserand undertakes to prove that Spenser's solemn statement concerning the substance of the whole *Faerie Queene*, made to the poet's friend and patron Sir Walter Raleigh, at Raleigh's request as Jusserand thinks, is "misleading, every word of it." Jusserand says:

> Spenser's statement [in the letter to Raleigh] that he intends "to portraict in Arthur, before he was king, the image of a brave knight, perfected in the twelve private morall vertues as Aristotle hath devised" is misleading, every word of it. There is no such definite list; Aristotle's number is not twelve, and the virtues he studies are far from being the same as those forming the basis of the *Faerie Queene*.[1]

That Jusserand's paper has not been without its influence was shown in a recent article by Professor Erskine, of Columbia University. Although Professor Erskine points out one false step in Jusserand's argument, he accepts his conclusion. In discussing "The Virtue of Friendship in the *Faerie Queene*," *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, XXIII (1915), 831–50, Professor Erskine asks, "Had Spenser read Montaigne, or Plutarch, or Cicero's *On Friendship*, or Aristotle's *Ethics?*" Replying to his own question, he says, "He may have read them all, though M. Jusserand has taught us to suspect the Aristotle." Again, Erskine speaks of Jusserand's "having shown that Spenser did not get his list of virtues from Aristotle."

It is the purpose of the present paper to show that not only are Jusserand's arguments faulty, but his conclusion is incorrect. Jusserand makes three main arguments: first, that Spenser's and Aristotle's lists of virtues are not the same in number; second, that they are quite unlike in nature; and, third, that Spenser actually derived his virtues, and his ideas concerning a list of twelve virtues,

[1] *Modern Philology*, III, 376.

from Lodowick Bryskett, who in his *Discourse of Civil Life* includes a discussion of moral virtues, in which the number twelve is mentioned.

I shall reply to these three main arguments in the order in which I have stated them.

The first of Jusserand's three main arguments, that Spenser's and Aristotle's lists of virtues are not the same in number, falls into three subdivisions or arguments: first, that "Aristotle draws nowhere any dogmatic list of virtues;" second, that it is difficult to know how to count Aristotle's virtues; and, third, that "Aristotle's number is not twelve," for, count his virtues as you will, you cannot get the number twelve. I take up the last subdivision first.

Jusserand finds that nine of Aristotle's virtues are certainly virtues, but that there is some doubt concerning the remaining four: Temperance, or Self-control; Shame, or Modesty; Friendship; and Justice.[1] Jusserand says:

> If we include both [Temperance and Modesty] we have a total of eleven; if we exclude both, a total of nine; if we admit Self-control alone, a total of ten. Adding arbitrarily Justice and Friendship, or only one of them . . . . we should have a total varying from ten to *thirteen;*[2] a total of twelve being perhaps the most arbitrary of all and the most difficult to reach.[3]

Now, it should be noted at the outset that a total of thirteen is exactly what we want. Spenser's total is not twelve. It is thirteen. In his letter to Raleigh, only a short distance from the assertion which Jusserand undertakes to disprove, Spenser makes the following statement:

> In the person of Prince Arthure I sette forth *magnificence*[4] in particular, which vertue for that (according to Aristotle and the rest) it is the perfection of all the rest, and conteineth in it them all, therefore, in the whole course I mention the deedes of Arthure applyable to that vertue, which I write of in that booke. But of the *xii. other vertues,*[4] I make xii. other knights the patrones, for the more variety of the history.

[1] The fact that Spenser wrote a Book on each of these four virtues—see *Faerie Queene*, Books II, III, IV, and V—might be expected to throw some light on whether Spenser counted them as virtues or not.

Hereafter references to book, canto, and stanza of the *Faerie Queene* are given without the title of the epic.

[2] Italics mine.

[3] *Mod. Phil.*, III, 374–75.

[4] Italics mine

So much for Jusserand's point that "Aristotle's number is not twelve." Neither is Spenser's. We may now proceed to find what is the nature of Aristotle's list of virtues, how Aristotle's virtues are to be counted, and how Spenser got his number of virtues.

In Book II, chap. vii, of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle discusses a list of moral virtues or qualities essential to the good man. They are exactly twelve in number: (1) Courage, (2) Temperance, or Self-control, (3) Liberality, (4) Magnificence, (5) Highmindedness, (6) the mean concerning Ambition, (7) Gentleness, or Mansuetude, (8) Truthfulness, (9) Wittiness, or Jocularity, (10) Friendliness, or Courtesy, (11) Modesty, or Shame, and (12) Righteous Indignation. Concerning this discussion Aristotle says: "For the present we are giving only a rough and summary account [of the virtues], and that is sufficient for our purpose; we will hereafter determine their character more exactly."[1] We are promised, then, a careful discussion of the moral virtues "hereafter." In Book III, chaps. ix ff., Book IV, and Book V, Aristotle keeps his word. Moreover, an introductory sentence and a concluding one mark the limits of this discussion of the moral virtues as definitely as two milestones. The first two sentences of III, ix, are as follows: "Let us then resume our consideration of the several virtues and discuss their nature, the subjects with which they deal, and the way in which they deal with them. *In so doing we shall ascertain their number.*"[2] The last sentence in Book V unmistakably closes the list of moral virtues: "This then may be taken as a sufficient description of Justice, and the other moral virtues." Between these two absolutely definite limits, Aristotle discusses exactly twelve good qualities or desirable means. In this careful consideration of the moral virtues, the same good qualities, or desirable means, are listed as in the less careful discussion which precedes it, with one exception: in the "rough and summary account" Righteous Indignation is included. We know from the *Rhetoric* that Aristotle decided that his discussion of this quality was false, as Envy and Malice, which he gave as its extremes, are not opposites, but compatible and coexistent.[3] In his second

[1] My quotations are from the translation by J. E. C. Welldon.

[2] Italics mine.

[3] See Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, Book II, chap. ix.

discussion of the moral virtues, which is to "determine their character more exactly" and "ascertain their number," he omits Righteous Indignation and adds Justice, leaving the number unchanged. Surely there is enough here to suggest the number twelve if any such suggestion were needed.

But Jusserand has difficulty in totalizing Aristotle's virtues, for he finds it hard to decide which ones are to be counted. In the first place, he contends that "Some of his virtues are only a branch or development of another virtue. . . . . Magnificence is only the same as [Liberality], but practiced by the very rich, instead of by the moderately rich, man."[1] Now it is plain that Aristotle's Magnificence and Liberality are not the same. It would be strange indeed if they were, since Aristotle treats them as two separate virtues. They are much the same in principle, as both imply being free in giving and spending. But practically they are very different. Any one who gives to the right cause, at the right time, in the right manner, and to the right amount, considering the means of the giver, and who takes from right sources, is liberal.[2] He has to avoid the extremes of illiberality and prodigality. The magnificent man, on the other hand, must avoid the extremes of meanness and vulgar display, or bad taste. He must be a kind of artist. "The magnificent man," says Aristotle, "is like a connoisseur in art; he has the faculty of perceiving what is suitable, and of spending large sums of money with good taste. . . . . With equal expenditure he will make the result more magnificent."[3] And, as we shall see later, Magnificence includes far more than this. The poor widow who gave the mites was liberal; but the problems she had to solve in being so were very different from those of a person who is in a position to practice the virtue of Magnificence and wishes to do so.

Again, Jusserand objects, "Others . . . . are treated of quite apart, at great length; but it is not clear whether, if one wanted to do what Aristotle neglected to perform—that is, to tabulate his moral virtues—these should, or should not, be admitted in the list. Such is the case with Justice. . . . . Such is the case also with

[1] *Mod. Phil.*, III, 374–75.

[2] *Nicomachean Ethics*, IV, i–iii; II, vii.

[3] *Ibid.*, IV, iv–v; II, vii; *Magna Moralia*, I, 26; and *Ethica Eudemia*, III, vi.

Friendship. . . . . Aristotle has treated them apart, and shown that *he* did not include them in his regular count."[1]

Jusserand's assertion that Aristotle treated Justice apart from the other moral virtues is a misinterpretation. Justice is not separated from the preceding discussion in Books III and IV; on the contrary, it is in the closest possible way connected with it. In Book IV, chap. xiii, while discussing Truthfulness, Aristotle says: "We are not speaking of one who is truthful in legal covenants, or of all such matters as lie within the domain of justice and injustice, for these would be matters belonging to a different virtue." Again, the last sentence in Book IV is as follows: "But let us now proceed to consider Justice." Hence, one can no more draw a line between Books IV and V than between Books III and IV. Finally, the sentence which so clearly and definitely closes the discussion of the moral virtues is, as we have already seen, the last sentence in Book V: "This then may be taken as a sufficient description of *Justice*, and the *other moral virtues*." One virtue, Friendship, Aristotle does treat "apart at great length." According to Jusserand its "admission into [Aristotle's] treatise is justified, not to say excused, on the plea that it is either a virtue or related to virtue, and that it is most necessary in life."[2] But it could hardly need a better justification.

Finally Jusserand points out: "Some, admitted into the class at one part of the work, are described elsewhere as doubtfully belonging to it. . . . . There is also a chapter on Shame (*αἰδώς*, Lat. *verecundia*), though 'it is not correct to call it a virtue.' But 'neither is Self-control,' adds Aristotle in the same chapter."[3] Thus Jusserand makes much of showing that Aristotle is sometimes uncertain whether a given one of his desirable means is a virtue or not—that is, whether or not it comes under a technical definition of virtue. And then, strangely enough, he expects Spenser to be severely technical when his master has not been. But Aristotle tells us plainly in Book I, chap. i, of his *Nicomachean Ethics*, and again in Book II, chap. ii, that in a discussion on ethics, scientific exactitude is impossible. He answers Jusserand's objections some centuries

[1] *Mod. Phil.*, III, 374–75.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 374.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 374–75.

before they were made. He says: "An educated person will expect accuracy in each subject only so far as the nature of the subject allows."[1] Jusserand overlooks the important fact that both Aristotle and Spenser are eminently practical in their aims. In Book II, chap. ii, Aristotle says: "Our present study is not, like other studies, purely speculative in its intention; for the object of our inquiry is not to know the nature of virtue but to become ourselves virtuous, as that is the sole benefit which it conveys." Spenser's statement to Raleigh of the object he had in writing the *Faerie Queene* shows the practical nature of that work: "The general end therefore of all the book is to fashion a gentleman or noble person in vertuous and gentle discipline."[2] With such a purpose, is it likely that Spenser would stop to quibble over whether such a quality as Temperance, for example, does or does not come under a technical definition of virtue? What would his gentleman be without it? Is it not reasonable that, in attempting to follow Aristotle, Spenser would take all of Aristotle's desirable means or good qualities? Whether certain of them come under a technical definition of virtue or not, they are virtues in any practical sense. And Aristotle himself regarded them as such, as is shown by the fact that he discussed them as virtues. Besides, they are absolutely necessary to a system which is to "fashion a gentleman or noble person" not only in "vertuous," but also in "gentle," discipline.

This brings us to a very simple explanation of how Spenser got his number of virtues. He simply took all of Aristotle's desirable means, or qualities essential to the good man. Now Aristotle discussed, all told, thirteen good qualities, or desirable means, as Jusserand himself observes. One of these, as Jusserand also observes, is Magnificence. Magnificence, as we saw, Spenser gives to Arthur, leaving exactly twelve others. Clearly, if one of Aristotle's virtues contains all the others, his virtues might properly be divided into "the twelve" and the *one* which includes the *twelve*.

So much for the number of Spenser's and Aristotle's virtues. We come now to Jusserand's argument that "the nature of the virtues considered by Spenser matches the Aristotelian selection

[1] *N. Eth.*, I, i.

[2] Spenser's Letter to Sir Walter Raleigh, included in all editions of the *Faerie Queene*.

scarcely better than their number"[1]—a proposition which to Jusserand means that the two do not match at all.

Before discussing the nature of Spenser's virtues, it will be necessary to clear the ground somewhat, by saying a word about how the *Faerie Queene* is to be interpreted. There is a notion that Spenser's episodes are unimportant. For example, Jusserand disposes of the lesson of one of Spenser's great cantos by saying, "It is only incidentally dwelt upon, forming the episode of Guyon's visit to Medina, Bk. II, c. 2."[2] And in this attitude toward the episodes Jusserand is by no means alone. Any notion that whatever is not a part of Spenser's main plot can have little to do with his meaning is based upon a misconception of the fundamental structure of Spenser's great poem. An episode filling one of Spenser's cantos—a great poem in itself—such as the one in which Guyon is taken by his Palmer (Reason or Prudence) to the house of Medina (the Mean), where the Knight of Temperance learns the fundamental conception of true Temperance, cannot be considered unimportant. Such an episode may be "only incidental" to some of the points named in Spenser's letter to Raleigh, in which the author undertakes to state the "general intention" and to give something of the plot and plan of more than half a million words, and to propose and name the contents of a second poem, which would probably[3] have contained another half million words, all in a four-page letter—a summary which disposes of the whole of the Book on Temperance in six lines. But in Spenser's development of any given virtue, such an episode is of very great importance.

It is mainly by means of the episodes that Spenser's discussion of the virtues is carried on. This fact will become clear as we proceed. We may note here, however, Spenser's direct testimony that his episodes are organic. In the Book on Courtesy, at the end of a three-canto episode showing Calidore's Courtesy among the lowly, Spenser makes it unmistakably clear that each episode in the *Faerie*

[1] *Mod. Phil.*, III, 375.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 381 and note.

[3] It will be observed that Spenser does not say how many Books will be in the second part; he speaks only of "these first twelve bookes" and of "the other part." Nor does he give the number of the political virtues. Aristotle gives nowhere a list of the political virtues.

Queene represents some phase of the virtue under discussion; that the author "never is astray."[1] Again, in the Book on Justice, in introducing the account of the spousal of Florimel, Spenser assures us that he is admitting to the poem nothing save what "with this present treatise doth agree, True vertue to advance."[2] And the episode turns out to be a study in just distribution of honors, which according to Aristotle is the essence of Justice.[3]

Moreover, Spenser does not intend that his readers shall misunderstand him. "By certaine signes here set in sundry place,"[4] he aims to see to it that the *reader* "never is astray." And among the most helpful of these "signes" are the very illuminating comments of the author, oftenest at the beginning, but sometimes in the middle of a canto.[5] No one will need to be reminded of the importance of Spenser's arguments to the cantos and his proems to the books. Sometimes a few lines spoken by one of the characters throw great light on the allegory of the poem.[6] Professor Greene has truly remarked, "Only a man of abundant leisure can read the [*Faerie Queene*] as Spenser would have it read."[7] To get the meaning, one must watch not only the enveloping plot and the episodes, but also every comment, every speech, every line, every word, and, frequently, in the case of proper names, every syllable. He must read the poem intensively—minutely:

> ne let him then admire,
> But yield his sence to be too blunt and bace,
> That no'te without an hound fine footing trace.[4]

So much for the manner in which Spenser is to be interpreted. Let us now examine, in the case of each of the six virtues developed by Spenser, Jusserand's argument that Spenser's and Aristotle's virtues are unlike in nature.

[1] VI, xii, 1–2. Cf. I, vii, 50; II, xii, 1; III, vi, 52; VI, iii, 25; VI, ix, 1.

[2] V, iii, 3.

[3] With this canto of Spenser's Book on Justice, cf. *N. Eth.*, V, ii, and V, iv, and *Politics*, II, vii. With Braggadocchio cf. Achilles' Coward, *Politics*, II, vii.

[4] Book II, Proem, stanza 4.

[5] See I, viii, 1, or I, x, 1. Other examples will be pointed out later.

[6] See, for example, I, viii, 49.

[7] H. L. Greene, "Allegory in Spenser, Bunyan, and Swift," *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, IV (1889), 181.

Concerning the subject of Spenser's first Book, Jusserand says: "Holiness is certainly not borrowed from Aristotle's series of moral virtues."[1] This is mere assertion, not argument. Possibly an argument is thought to lie in a supposed inconsistency between "holiness" and "moral virtues;" but if so, it should be remembered that Spenser certainly classed holiness as a moral virtue, as is shown not only by the letter to Raleigh but also by the "XII. Morall vertues" of the title page of the *Faerie Queene*.

Again, Jusserand says that Spenser's reference to the twelve moral virtues of Aristotle was "a mere afterthought, probably, imagined after part of the poem had been written; for Spenser begins with the virtue of Holiness, conspicuously absent as we saw from Aristotle's enumeration," etc.[2] Surely it is incredible that Spenser should contemplate a great epic for years (see Spenser's letter to Harvey under date of 1580) and finally write the forty-five thousand words of the Book on Holiness without even a general notion of the plot and purpose of his poem. Besides, the fact that the machinery of the court of Gloriana and of the quests is introduced at the very beginning of Book I[3] indicates that the plan of the letter to Raleigh was not an "afterthought." But even if we were to admit that the reference to Aristotle was an afterthought, conceived after the first Book was written, it would have to fit, at least approximately. And Book I, Holiness, was one of the three which accompanied the letter to Raleigh. How could Spenser say that each of the twelve Books of the *Faerie Queene* would contain one of Aristotle's twelve moral virtues, "of which these three bookes contayn three,"[4] when the first of the three had nothing whatever to do with Aristotle? Could he expect to deceive Raleigh, Sidney, Elizabeth, and the rest of the brilliant circle for whom he wrote?

Obviously Jusserand misunderstands, or has forgotten, the meaning of Aristotle's virtue of Highmindedness, or Magnanimity; for he sees in it only "a kind of ornament applicable to all the virtues."[5] It is well known that this virtue represents Aristotle's conception of

[1] *Mod. Phil.*, III, 376.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 381.

[3] I, i. See also canto vii, stanza 46.

[4] Letter to Raleigh.

[5] *Mod. Phil.*, III, 382.

absolute moral perfection. "The highminded man," says Aristotle, "seems to be one who thinks himself worthy of great things, and who is worthy of them. For he who thinks himself worthy of great things without being so is foolish, and no virtuous person is foolish or absurd." "There will be one particular object of his interest . . . . honor." "Highmindedness, then, has to do with honor on a great scale." "The highminded man, as being worthy of the highest things, will be in the highest degree good." "It seems that the highminded man possesses such greatness as belongs to every virtue." "It seems that Highmindedness is, as it were, the crown of the virtues, as it enhances them and cannot exist apart from them." Finally, the following sentence shows Aristotle's exalted conception of Highmindedness: "He [the highminded man] will be only moderately pleased at great honors conferred upon him by virtuous people, as feeling that he obtains what is naturally his due or even less than his due; for it would be impossible to devise an honor that should be proportionate to perfect virtue."[1]

But is the Knight of Holiness Aristotle's highminded man? Some change in the conception of the Red Cross Knight was, of course, necessary on account of the fact that he was a Christian hero. So far as possible, however, Spenser has made him conform to Aristotle's conception of Highmindedness. First, he is characterized by a high opinion of himself. For proof of his amazing self-confidence we have not only Spenser's letter to Raleigh, but also the *Faerie Queene* itself. "A tall clownishe younge man" who has never worn armor,[2] he enters the court of great Gloriana,

> Where noblest knights were to be found on earth,[3]

and to the great wonder of the Queen and the disappointment and mortification of Una, whom he proposes to help, demands the greatest of all quests, the establishment of Truth—true Christianity—and the defeat of Error and the Devil, a quest so difficult that, although great knights from all over the world have tried it, none has been able to fulfil it.[4] Assuredly he thinks himself worthy of great things. But he not only *thinks* himself worthy; he *is* worthy—as is abundantly proved, not alone by his ability to wear the Christian armor, which

[1] For Aristotle's discussion of Highmindedness see *Nicomachean Ethics*, IV, vii ff.
[2] Letter to Raleigh and *F. Q.*, I, i, 1. [3] I, iii, 28. [4] I, vii, 45.

is the test,[1] nor by Una's later testimony concerning his great work,[2] but also by his final triumph over all enemies including the Dragon of Evil.[3] In the second place, his chief thought is the winning of great earthly honor. His "noble heart" is "with child of glorious great intent" and

> Can never rest, untill it forth have brought
> Th' eternall brood of glorie excellent.[4]

"All for prayse and honour he did fight."[5] From first to last the Knight of Holiness is in pursuit of honor. He has come to Faerie Court in the first place to seek for fame:

> prickt with courage, and thy forces pryde,
> To Faery court thou cam'st to seeke for fame.[6]

Upon our first introduction to him, at the beginning of the *Faerie Queene*, we are told:

> Upon a great adventure he was bond,
> That greatest Gloriana to him gave,
> That greatest Glorious Queene of Faerie lond,
> To winne him worship, and her grace to have,
> *Which of all earthly things he most did crave.*[7]

And when he appears in the third Book, after he has attained perfect Holiness, his character in this respect is unchanged:

> Then he forth on his journey did proceede,
> To seeke adventures, which mote him befall,
> And win him worship through his warlike deed,
> *Which alwayes of his paines he made the chiefest meed.*[8]

Nor does the Red Cross Knight seek merely great honor; he seeks the greatest of all earthly honor. Una tells him that his fight with the Dragon of Evil

> shall ye evermore renowmed make,
> *Above all knights on earth, that batteill undertake.*[9]

[1] Letter to Raleigh.
[2] I, vii, 47–49.
[3] I, xi.
[4] I, v, 1.
[5] I, v, 7.
[6] I, x, 66.
[7] I, i, 3. Italics in quotations from Spenser are all mine. I quote from Smith and de Selincourt's *Poetical Works of Spenser*, Oxford, 1912, but I have disregarded the italicization of proper names and followed modern usage in regard to *u*, *v*, and *j*.
[8] III, iv, 4.
[9] I, xi, 2.

And Heavenly Comtemplation has already told him what this great honor is to be. The knight is to be Saint George, famous throughout Europe as a military saint, and the patron saint of England:

> For thou emongst those Saints, whom thou doest see,
> Shalt be a Saint, and thine owne nations frend
> And Patrone: thou Saint George shalt called bee,
> Saint George of mery England, the signe of victoree.[1]

Finally, that the Red Cross Knight's Highmindedness may be complete and convincing in Spenser's and Aristotle's[2] view, Heavenly Contemplation explains that the knight is of high birth—

> thou springst from ancient race
> Of Saxon kings.[3]

And we know that it is by deliberate plan, not by accident, that Spenser makes the Red Cross Knight's one great passion love of honor. Even Heavenly Contemplation sanctions the knight's pursuit of earthly fame.[4] And the poet, in his own person—

> That I this man of God his godly armes may blaze[5]—

prays aid of

> The Nourse of time, and everlasting fame
> That warlike hands ennoblest with immortall name.[6]

The moral perfection which the knight attains is, no doubt, to be expected:

> from the first unto the last degree,
> His mortall life he learned had to frame
> In holy righteousnesse, without rebuke or blame.[7]

It is not to be overlooked that all of Spenser's great knights are characterized by Highmindedness, as they are by all of the other moral virtues. This is in accordance with Aristotle's tendency to make any given virtue include all the others, and his teaching that "Neither greatness nor highmindedness is possible without complete virtue."[8] But although, on account of this close relation between the virtues, such great knights as Guyon and Artegall are characterized by Highmindedness, none of Spenser's knights, except possibly

[1] I, x, 61.

[2] This statement is warranted not only by Aristotle's and Spenser's strong feeling of aristocracy, but also by Aristotle's discussion of Highmindedness in *N. Eth.*, IV, viii.

[3] I, x, 65.

[4] I, x, 59, 60, and 62.

[5] I, xi, 7.

[6] I, xi, 5.

[7] I, x, 45.

[8] *N. Eth.*, IV, viii.

the all-perfect Arthur, can compare in Highmindedness with the Knight of Holiness. That especial emphasis should be laid on Arthur's Highmindedness would naturally result not only from the close relation between the virtues, but also from Arthur's moral perfection. But it is in Book I, where Arthur tells his dream of glory, that we are most impressed with his Highmindedness. And according to Spenser's plan in the letter to Raleigh, Arthur must, in the Book on Holiness, represent the same virtue as the Knight of Holiness: "In the whole course I mention the deedes of Arthure applyable to that vertue, which I write of in that booke." Consequently, if Arthur represents Highmindedness in Book I, so must the Knight of the Red Cross. Thus it is clear that the Knight of Holiness exemplifies Aristotle's virtue of Highmindedness. Nor was Spenser doing anything unusual in thus combining pagan and sacred writings. He was only doing what many divines did both before and after him. Moreover, he was only doing what he himself did again and again in the *Faerie Queene*, sometimes in a rather surprising fashion. For example, in II, xii, 52, he compares Acrasia's Bower, falsely named the "Bowre of blis," not only to "Parnasse" and Mount Ida, but also to the Garden of Eden, the comparison being unfavorable even to Eden. Again, the marriage rites of Una and the Knight of Holiness, described in I, xii, are pagan, not Christian.[1] There is nothing surprising, however, in his combining Aristotle's Highmindedness with Christianity; for the combination is simply moral perfection (represented by the Knight of Holiness) married to Christian truth (Una).

I have discussed the case of Holiness at considerable length because it is the only one which is in any way doubtful. In Books II–VI it is certain that Spenser is consciously and deliberately following Aristotle.

The subject of Spenser's second Book is Temperance. Jusserand has to admit that "[Spenser's virtue of] Temperance truly and plainly corresponds to one of Aristotle's [virtues]."[2] Aristotle outlines Temperance briefly in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, II, vii, discusses it at some length in III, xiii–xv, and continues the discussion throughout

[1] See I, xii, 37.

[2] *Mod. Phil.*, III, 376.

most of Book VII. Spenser, in his Book on Temperance, draws upon all three discussions.

Concerning the virtue of Spenser's third Book, Jusserand says: "Chastity may be held to have been [one of Aristotle's virtues], if we give the word the sense of 'shame' (*verecundia*), and neglect the fact that Aristotle, while studying it, declares that this 'shame' is not a virtue."[1] That both Spenser and Aristotle were interested in practical morality, not in whether such qualities as Temperance and Chastity are technically virtues, we have already seen. Although Aristotle tends to make this virtue of Shame, or Modesty, all-inclusive, just as he tends to make all the others, his discussion of it in the *Nicomachean Ethics*[2] and in the *Rhetoric*[3] leaves unquestionable the fact that he means it particularly to apply to sex morality. It is hardly necessary to state that in his Book on Chastity Spenser is discussing sex morality from the standpoint of Shame, or Modesty, on the one hand, and Shamelessness, on the other.[4] It should be added that sex morality is also an important part of Aristotle's discussion of Temperance, including Licentiousness and Incontinence. Aristotelian Temperance, in the strict or particular sense, applies to "meats" and "drinks" and "what are called the pleasures of love."[5] Aristotelian Shame, or Modesty, in the strict sense, applies, of course, to the last of these. Spenser, in his Book on Chastity, drew not only upon Aristotle's discussion of Shame, or Modesty, but also upon that part of his discussion of Temperance and Incontinence which deals with sex morality.

Concerning the subjects of Spenser's fourth and fifth Books, Jusserand says: "The reader knows what the case is with Friendship and Justice."[6] I believe he does.

Finally, concerning Courtesy, the subject of Spenser's sixth Book, Jusserand says: "Courtesy may be held to correspond, if to anything, to Aristotle's friendliness, but not without a considerable

[1] *Mod. Phil.*, III, 376.

[2] *N. Eth.*, II, vii; IV, xv.

[3] *Rhetoric*, II, vi, xii, and xiii.

[4] See, for example, III, i, 48. See also, III, i, 50; III, ii, 40–41; III, iv, 45; III, v, 55; III, vii, 49; III, viii, 32; and III, xii, 24.

[5] *N. Eth.*, III, xiii.

[6] *Mod. Phil.*, III, 376.

extension and modernization of the word. . . . . Aristotle's description of friendliness best suits, however, without matching it exactly, the modern notion of courtesy."[1] The *New English Dictionary* reveals nothing inconsistent in Spenser's discussing under the name of Courtesy the virtue which Aristotle says is most *like* Friendliness. But what really counts, a comparison of Spenser's Book on Courtesy with this Near-Friendliness, shows that the two really do match. The sphere of Aristotle's Near-Friendliness is "human society, with its common life and association in words and deeds." The virtue is a mean between flattery, obsequiousness, complaisance, on the one hand, and surliness, disagreeableness, contentiousness, on the other. Aristotle says: "It most resembles Friendliness; for the person in whom it exists answers to our idea of a virtuous friend, except that friendliness includes affection as well. . . . . He will so act alike to strangers and acquaintances," etc.[2] Thus Aristotle's Near-Friendliness is a kind of Golden Rule: In your association with others, including strangers, speak to them and act toward them as a virtuous friend would do.

Spenser's virtue of Courtesy matches this Aristotelian ideal exactly. It allows neither flattery, on the one hand, nor contentiousness, on the other.[3] It consists in acting toward others as a virtuous friend would act. It should be remembered, however, that with both Aristotle and Spenser friendship includes love; and also that, in accordance with Aristotle's and Spenser's tendency to make any given virtue include all the others, Courtesy and Discourtesy will include other virtues and vices.

> For seldome yet did living creature see,
> That curtesie and manhood ever disagree.[4]

That the virtue of Spenser's sixth Book does consist in acting toward others as a true friend would act is shown by the characters and the episodes. Calidore, Tristram, Calepine, Prince Arthur, and others represent Courtesy, or Friendliness. Maleffort, Crudor, and Briana, who maltreat strangers (c.i.); the "proud discourteous knight" whom Tristram slays (c. ii); the contemptible Sir Turpine, who will not

[1] *Ibid.*
[2] *N. Eth.*, IV, xii.
[3] See, for example, Spenser's exposition of Calidore's Courtesy in VI, i, 2–3.
[4] VI, iii, 40.

give lodging to Calepine and his wounded lady, or help the wounded woman over the ford, and who even attacks the defenseless knight (c. iii, vi, viii); Mirabella, who delights in the sufferings of her lovers (c. vii); the "salvage nation," which preys upon strangers (c. viii, stanzas 35 ff.); and the "theeves" who lead Pastorell into captivity (c. ix, xi)—these are some of the examples of Unfriendliness, of not acting toward others as a virtuous friend would act. And, finally, the Blatant Beast is not Slander, as it is sometimes named, nor yet the Puritans, as it is oftenest named. It is the Spirit of Unfriendliness;[1] it is Malice, Malevolence, Envy, Despite, Slander, Contentiousness, and is represented in one place,[2] no doubt, by the most contentious element among the Puritans. The Blatant Beast, like Duessa,

> could d'on so manie shapes in sight,
> As ever could cameleon colours new.[3]

Besides, Spenser more than once shows by the speeches of his characters, combined with the plot, that he is keeping before him Aristotle's ideal of acting toward others as a true friend would act. For example, in VI, iii, 15, Aldine is talking to Sir Calidore, the Knight of Courtesy. The two are strangers, having seen each other but once before. We are told:

> In th'end his [Calidore's] kyndly *courtesie* to prove,
> He [Aldine] him by all the bands of love besought,
> And *as it mote a faithfull friend behove*,
> To safeconduct his love, and not for ought
> To leave, till to her fathers house he had her brought.

W. F. DeMoss

University of Wisconsin

[*To be concluded*] see p. 245

[1] With V, xii, 28–43 and VI, i, 7–10, in which passages the Blatant Beast is identified with Envy and Detraction, the latter including Malevolence, and with VI, v, 12–22, in which the Blatant Beast is identified with Malice, Deceit, and Detraction, compare the author's comment, or literal exposition of Discourtesy, in VI, vii, 1–2.

[2] See VI, xii, 22–41; but note in VI, xii, 22 and 23, that the Blatant Beast has gone "through every place" and "through all estates," all ranks of life, before he comes to the "Clergy."

[3] IV, i, 18.

CHAUCERIANA

I

Troilus, 1, 687–88:

> And witeth wel, that bothe two ben vices,
> Mistrusten alle, or elles alle leve.

Cf. Seneca *Epistulae Morales* 1. 3. 4 (ed. Heinse, p. 5): utrumque enim vitium est, et omnibus credere et nulli.

Troilus, 1, 740–41:

> For it is seyd men maketh ofte a yerde
> With which the maker is himself y-beten.

Wander, in his *Sprichwoerter-Lexikon*, gives, under the caption *Ruthe*, a great many forms of the proverb, but none so close to Chaucer's as any of the seven from Provençal poetry given by Cnyrim in his *Sprichwoerter* (Nos. 779–85).

Troilus, 1, 963–66:

> It far'th of som servise,
> As plante a tree, or herbe, in sondry wise,
> And on the morwe pulle it up as blive!
> No wonder is, though it may never thrive.

Cf. Seneca *op. cit.* 1. 2. 3 (p. 3): non convalescit planta, quae saepe transfertur.

Troilus, 1, 1065–69. Professor Kittredge pointed out in *Modern Philology*, VII, 481 that this passage is derived from Geoffrey de Vinsauf, *Nova Poetria*, vss. 43–45 (in Leyser, *Historia Poetarum et Poematum Medii Aevi*, p. 864). Chaucer refers to the same work in B 4537 ff. It is to be further noted that the use of *color*, *colorare* in a rhetorical sense is very frequent in the *Nova Poetria*, frequent enough to suggest that Chaucer may have derived the usage from de Vinsauf, who, however, nowhere couples *color* with *figure*, as Chaucer sometimes does. Cf. *Nova Poetria*, vss. 201, 745, 746, 748, 879, 924, 928, 929, 946, 955, 957, 962, 988, 993, 995, 1023, 1024, 1037, 1038, etc. Chaucer's *Almena* for *Alcmena* (*Troilus*, 3, 1428) may be compared with *Almenam* in *Nova Poetria*, vs. 623.

Troilus, 2, 188–89:

> Withouten hond, me semeth that in toune
> For this miracle here I ech belle soune.

For the miraculous ringing of bells on joyful or solemn occasions references, chiefly from Germanic literature, may be found in Child's *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, I, 173, 231; III, 235, 519. My attention is called to this fact by Dr. W. G. Dodd's *Courtly Love in Chaucer and Gower*. I would add the following: Boccaccio, *Decamerone, Giornata Seconda, Novella Prima:* Per la qual cosa, o vero o non vero che si fosse, morendo egli, addivenne, secondo che i Trivigiani affermano, che nell' ora della sua morte le campane della maggior chiesa di Trivigi, tutte, senza essere da alcuno tirate, cominciarono a sonare. Il che in luogo di miracolo avendo, questo Arrigo esser santo dicevano tutti.

I have found four examples of rime royal in French poetry earlier than the fourteenth century. Cf. Conon de Béthune, ed. Wallensköld, pp. 282–85; Guiot de Provins, ed. Orr, Chanson iv; same in Wackernaegel xiiii (from a fourteenth-century manuscript); anonymous (Wackernaegel xli); Gace Brulé, ed. Huet (Société des Anciens Textes Français), Chanson xiii (p. 31). Chaucer first introduced the stanza into English poetry. In all his French predecessors the stanza is used for lyric rather than for narrative; and even in Chaucer it often reverts to or continues the lyric tradition.

II

Canterbury Tales, B 4047–50. The belief that the cock crew exactly on the hour is alluded to in *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight*, 2008:

> Bi vch kok þat crue, he knwe wel þe steuen.

"By each cock that crew he knew well the hour."

B 4039–54. The best commentary on the colors of Chantecleer is the song given by Padelford in *The Cambridge History of English Literature* (II, 444–45), and by Cook in his excellent *Literary Middle English Reader* (p. 429). The *Nun's Priest's Tale* has several echoes of early English lyric poetry which add to the burlesque effect of the whole. And I am inclined to believe that Chaucer was

acquainted with some version—earlier than the extant fifteenth-century manuscript—of the song in question, and had it in mind while drawing the portrait of Chantecleer. To suppose that the song in question echoed Chaucer is of course perfectly possible, but to do so is to sacrifice something of the spirit of burlesque in the *Nun's Priest's Tale*. Other echoes of early English song in the *Tale* are B 4084: *herte in holde;* and B 4069: *My lief is faren in londe.*

B 4108. *tool,* "weapon." Cf. *Romeo and Juliet,* I, 1, 31–32: Draw thy *tool;* here comes two of the house of Montagues; and Milton, *Samson Agonistes,* 137:

> In scorn of their proud arms and warlike *tools.*

B 4243. *wlatsom.* That the *w* of initial *wl* was pronounced by Chaucer might be inferred from the evidence of the alliterative verse of his age. The evidence is not, however, wholly satisfactory, since no contemporary alliterative verse occurs in Chaucer's dialect. Cf. nevertheless *Cleanness,*

> 831: *W*elawynnely *w*lonk tyl þay *w*aschen hade
> 1501: So þe *w*orcher of þis *w*orlde *w*lates þer-*w*ith
> 541: Lo! suche a *w*rakful *w*o for *w*latsum dedeȝ

Cf. also *William of Palerne,* 1634:

> but now a *w*hile *w*ol i stinte· of þis *w*lonke murþe [=proud mirth]

B 4414. The *Oxford Dictionary* perfectly establishes the use of *gladly* in the sense of "usually," "habitually," and even the editors of Chaucer are beginning to take notice of the fact. The following are examples of the usage later than any given by the said *Dictionary.* I have some doubt about the case from Milton.

Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey (quoted in *Anglia,* XXIX, *New Series,* XVII, 335):

> Who *gladly* halsethe ye golden meane
> Voyde of dayngers advisedly hath his home.

Ascham, *The Scholemaster* (Ascham, *English Works,* ed. W. A. Wright, p. 224): Yet euen those that be learned and wittie trauelers, when they be disposed to prayse traueling, as a great commendacion, and the best Scripture they haue for it, they *gladlie* recite the third verse of Homere in his first booke of Odyssea, etc.

Watson (quoted by Ascham, *loc. cit.*):

> All trauellers do *gladly* report great prayse of Vlysses.

Milton, *Comus*, 410–13:

> but where an equall poise of hope and feare
> dos arbitrate the event my nature is
> that I incline to hope rather then feare
> and *gladly* banish squint suspicion.

Cf. also the use of French *volontiers* as in Machaut, *Le Dit du Lyon*, 1917–18:

> Et pour ce qu'on dit que cremour
> N'est pas *volentiers* sans amour, etc.,

and in Hugo, *Les Misérables*, Part 1, Book 5, Chapter 3, Paragraph 3: Il emportait *volontiers* un fusil dans ses promenades, mais il s'en servait rarement. This use of *volontiers* is very common in present-day French.

B 4446. *colde.* We still say *cold comfort.* In *William of Palerne*, 1656, we have *kares colde;* in *Sir Ferumbras*, 4213, we have *cold ys my red;* and in the *Roman de Troie* we have frequently the phrase "cold news." Cf. Herodotus 6. 108: ἐπικουρίη ψυχρή, and Euripides *Alcestis* 353: ψυχρὰν μέν οἶμαι τέρψιν.

B 4573. *Talbot* as the proper name of a dog appears in a song quoted by Padelford (*loc. cit.*):

> *Talbot*, my hounde, with a mery taste
> All about the grene wode he gan cast.

It is barely possible, though not more than barely, that Chaucer's use of *Talbot* as the proper name of a dog was suggested by the lyric poetry of his day. *Talbot* is also a common noun signifying a large, white or light-colored hound, having hanging ears, heavy jaws, and great powers of scent. This hunting dog was introduced into England by the Talbot family, but it is uncertain whether the family was named after the dog or the dog after the family. A pun upon the name of the species of dog and the name of the renowned enemy of Joan of Arc is found in *Political Songs* (Rolls Series, II, 222):

> He is bownden that oure dore shulde kepe
> That is *Talbott* oure goode dogge.

See *Oxford* and *Century Dictionaries* under *Talbot.*

B 4590. *skriked.* Cf. Defoe, *Captain Singleton* (ed. Aitken, p. 263): hallowing and *skreeking* in a manner that it is impossible to describe.

C 406. *a-blakeberyed.* Skeat pointed out the relation between the verbal in *-ed* and the Anglo-Saxon verbal in *-að*, but the intermediate form in *-eth* is so rare that I will cite the following from *Sir Ferumbras:*

2222: & Summe *a* deer *hontep* of hem þar went: & some to fox and hare
3730: Rennyngge *a-streyey* þar on þe waye
5532: *A-strayey* on þe grene

With *a-strayey* for *a-strayeþ* cf. the sixteenth and seventeenth century spelling *ye* for *the*, the *y* being used as a substitute for *þ*.

C 953. *seintuarie*, "a sacred object"; or, more exactly, used collectively for "sacred things." Not in the modern sense of "holy place." Instances of *saintuaire* in the sense of sacred object (not used collectively) are *Roman de Troie*, 25515–16:

Des *saintuaires* plus preisiez
Ert li auteus pleins e chargiez;

and *Cligés*, 1194–96:

Tot le monde, encois an feist
Saintuaire, si con je cuit,
Si l'aorast et jor et nuit.

F 250. *he Moyses.* This use of a personal pronoun before a proper personal name occurs not only in the Scandinavian languages, but also and very frequently in Middle Welsh. Cf. *Mabinogion* (ed. Rhys and Evans), p. 19, ll. 26–27: *Hitheu riannon* a diuynnwys attei athrawon a doethon, *She Riannon* (it was) who summoned to herself doctors and sages; *ibid.*, pp. 11–12: Rof i a duw heb *ynteu bwyll* llyna vy atteb i ytti, "Between me and God," said he Powell, "this is my answer to thee." The Welsh language applies the usage to common nouns as well as to personal names. Cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 78–79: Sef a wnaeth *ynteu yr eryr*, this (is) what *he the eagle* did.

III

The Franklin's Tale.—In *The Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, XVI, 406, Professor Schofield, the author of a *History of English Literature from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer*, which no competent person will fail heartily to praise, suggested that "a careful analysis of the *Franklin's Tale* reveals the fact that at

bottom it is a simple story of an unusually happy marriage between the British Lord Arveragus and his beautiful wife Dorigen." I have never been able to understand this contention. To me the marriage referred to seems to be merely the background of the story, which is itself concerned not with married happiness, but with an interruption in married happiness; and tells of a wife by the seashore bewailing the absence of her husband at sea; of a husband not only resigning his wife when he is bound by every consideration of honor to retain her, but actually so far forgetting all "gentillesse" as to threaten her with death in case she should reveal his ignominious conduct; and of a woman pursued by attentions which are equally unwelcome and unlawful.

Professor Kittredge in his *Chaucer and His Poetry*, page 45, remarked, "Few facts of history, be it sacred or profane, are more solidly established than that Geoffrey Chaucer, in his habit as he lived, was not naïf. . . . . Chaucer was admittedly a humorist, and naïveté is incompatible with a sense of humor." I do not find as a matter of ordinary observation that contradictions are so nicely excluded from human nature. And in literary history, if we find Wordsworth, one of the distinctly great and enduring British poets, frequently falling into the sorriest kind of prose, prose that no versification can disguise, we need not be surprised if we find Chaucer, a consummate humorist, falling at times into something distinctly naïve.

At any rate, no word seems to me so happily to characterize certain features of the *Franklin's Tale* as does the word naïve. An important theme running through Chaucer's story, the essential theme of the story as we have every reason to suppose that he found it, is the sacredness of a promise. Could anything be more naïve than to treat the casual promise of Dorigen, which was intended to be absolutely ironical, as more binding than her marriage vow, which had been made quite literally? Dorigen's promise to Aurelius was only a rhetorical way of saying that she never would desert her husband for the young man who was paying her his addresses. In treating her answer literally, as if she were making a bargain (rather than expressing with the utmost possible emphasis her determination to remain loyal to her husband), Aurelius really forfeited all claim to be considered "gentle," generous, or even honorable.

Nor is it enough to say that this was all in the story as Chaucer found it, and that in accepting what he found Chaucer by no means incurs a charge of naïveté. There are other features of the story which may even have been Chaucer's addition to the naïveté of his original. Do Dorigen and Aurelius meet by accident or by design of Aurelius in F 1499–1508? Chaucer (shall we not say naïvely?) assures us that they meet both by accident and by design. And how is it that nobody, neither Dorigen, Arveragus, nor the poet himself, shows the slightest sign of being either shocked or amused when the knight who has promised to continue into married life the homage of courtship suddenly threatens her with death if she disclose their secret (F 1481–84)?

Evidently the beauty of the *Franklin's Tale* is of that naïve order found in the primitives of the Italian Renaissance, paintings which freely violate the anatomy and perspective that have become basic to nearly all modern European art, but which nevertheless command the enthusiastic admiration of the more intelligent observers by the beauty that remains, and even seems to be enhanced by what is lacking. There are in the *Franklin's Tale* various truly charming descriptions, there are delicate sentiments, and the character of Dorigen is in itself a masterpiece.

It has often been observed that Chaucer's insistence on "the grisly rokkes blake" and on the horrors of shipwreck is a mark of local color connecting the story with Brittany. A few sentences from the *Pierre Nozière* of Anatole France descriptive of the Breton coast furnish admirable illustration: "The ocean and the cliffs change their appearance every minute. The billows are alternately white, green and violet; and the rocks which, a moment ago, were flashing their veins of mica, are now as black as ink" (p. 283); "It is still said that, on this shore, the souls in torment walk and weep, while the bones of those who have been shipwrecked knock at the doors of the fishermen and demand burial" (p. 286).

Further notes of local color are perhaps to be found in the description of Christmas festivities. I certainly suspect that the *bugle-horn* (F 1253) from which "Janus" drinks the wine is a Celtic note retained from Chaucer's source. The drinking-horn, of course, figures largely in Teutonic history and tradition, but I know no case

of its retention in ceremonial or festive usage so late as it was retained at Quimper in Brittany. In this town a cup formed of the horn of an urus, or wild ox, was retained in the ceremony of Saint Cecilia's Day until 1793. See Parède, *La Bretagne Poétique*, pp. 28–29. For the drinking-horn in early Celtic literature the *locus classicus* is perhaps in the very ancient tale of *Kulhwch and Olwen*, which twice uses the formula, "The knife is in the meat, and the drink is in the horn, and there is treading of feet in the hall," as an excuse for not opening the castle gate to a stranger. Cf. Rhys and Evans, *Red Book of Hergest*, I, 126: kyllell a edyw ym bwyt a llynn ym *bual*, ac amsathyr yn neuad; also p. 103, where we have exactly the same words except that *yn* is omitted before *neuad*.

I also suspect that F 1255,

> And "Nowel" crieth every lusty man,

describes a custom more or less distinctive of Brittany, though not exclusively Breton.

F 734. *oon the faireste under sonne.* I will illustrate this idiom with examples drawn from a work of mine on Chaucerian syntax which is not yet published. *Faireste* is used as a substantive and in apposition with the numeral *oon*. That this is the correct way to parse the phrase is shown by a glance at examples of the same idiom in cognate Germanic dialects, for which I am indebted to Professors Einenkel and Kellner:

Blickling Homilies, 73. 21: þaer waeron *þreo þa betstan ele*, there three the best ointments.

Aelfric, *Exodus*, 32. 21: *ane þa maestan synne* and gode *þa laþustan*, a sin one the greatest and to God the most displeasing.

Iwein, 334: *ein das schoenste gras*, one the fairest grass.

Iwein, 1314: si muose toten sehn *einen den liebesten man*, she must see killed one the dearest man.

Reinaert (Flemish), 137: *ene die meste* overdaet.

Chaucer never uses the idiom with any other numeral than one, but examples with higher numerals occur in English even as late as the eighteenth century. The first three examples of those given below, as well as the seventh, are pointed out by Einenkel or Kellner; the rest are of my own collecting:

Guy of Warwick, 8097: *Two the beste* then slayne had y.

Robert of Gloucester, *Chronicle*, 34: *þre þe beste yles.*

Trevisa, *Higden's Polychronicon* (Rolls Series), I, 199: Out of þilke hil[les] springeþ *þre þe noblest ryveres* of al Europa, þat beeþ i-cleped þe Ryne, Danubius, and Rone.

William of Palerne, 2162: *two þe bremest* white beres þat euer burn on loked.

Ibid., 3943–44:

> & treuli astit after him· *two hundered & seuen*
> *þe realest rinkes* of þe reaume· ded riȝt þat ilke

Ascham, *The State of Germany* (in *English Works*, ed. Wright, p. 163): And to let other matter of Germany passe, euen this last yeare within the compasse of eight monethes he professed himselfe open enemy against *foure the greatest poweres* that I knowe vpon earth.

Spenser, *Faerie Queene*, I, vii, 8: The hight of *three the tallest sonnes* of mortall seed.

Thomas May, *History of the Parliament of England Which Began Nov. 3, 1640:* how wicked the manners of Rome were grown, how the chief rulers were given to avarice and oppression, and the whole state drowned in luxury, lusts and riot, as you may see upon that subject in *two the most elegant* of them [i.e., of the Roman poets].

Colley Cibber, *The Careless Husband*, Act 2, Scene 2: Now I think deferring a dun, and getting rid of one's wife, are *two the most agreeable sweets* in the liberties of an English subject.

F 942: *Withouten coppe* he drank al his penaunce. Professor W. A. Neilson has convinced me that in my *Notes on Chaucer* this passage is wrongly explained, and that *withouten coppe* means "under difficulties." The expression occurs twice in the pseudo-Chaucerian *Tale of Beryn*, thus:

> 306: ffor such was his fortune, he drank *with-out þe cupp*
> 460: He shall drynk for kittes love *with-out cup or pot*

"To drink one's woe," "penance," etc. is a figure of which Chaucer is very fond. Cf. *Troilus*, 2, 784; 3, 1035; 3, 1215–16; *Hous of Fame*, 3, 789–90. Every one will recall *Saint Luke* 21. 42: "Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me." But it is worth adding that

Froissart represents love as a beverage. Cf. *Le Paradys d'Amours*, 676–78:

> Encor croi que depuissedi
> Qu'au dieu d'Amours fesis hommage
> Tu as gousté de son *buvrage*.

And in the same poem (738–39) we are told that the god of Love makes one "drink good medicine":

> Il *fait bon medicine boire*
> Dont on conforte sa santé.

F 1325. *but youre grace.* That this is better taken as meaning "without your permission" than "except your favor" is, I hope, too evident to require any argument. For *but*, or as it is sometimes spelled *boute*, in the sense of "without," cf. *William of Palerne:*

> 1704: Wiȝtly *boute* mo wordes· sche went fo[r]þ stille
> 1882–83: þei ete at here ese· as þei miȝt þanne
> *boute* salt oþer sauce· or any semly drynk

See also 1863, 2008, 2687, and Still, *Cottar*, 175 (A.D. 1845, cited by the *English Dialect Dictionary):*

> Gie me the man, whate'er his creed,
> . . . . . .
> Wha speaks the truth *but* fear or dread.

The word *grace*, meaning "permission," occurs in the *Romaunt of the Rose*, 4079–80:

> For no man moo into this place
> Of me to entre shal have *grace*.

HENRY BARRETT HINCKLEY

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

NEW LIFE-RECORDS OF CHAUCER

The *Calendar of the Patent Rolls* for the periods 1370–1374 and 1374–1377 (published in 1914 and 1916 respectively) contains abstracts of two documents which are not included in the *Life-Records of Chaucer* and which, to the best of my knowledge, are new to students of Chaucer's life. These abstracts are as follows:

Patent Rolls, 48 Edward III, Part I, membrane 13.

1374. June 8. Westminster. Grant, during pleasure, to Geoffrey Chaucer of the offices of controller of the custom and subsidy of wools, hides and woolfells, and controller of the petty custom of wines and of 3 *d.* of the pound, also of cloths and other customable merchandise in the port of London.

By p. s.[1]

Patent Rolls, 51 Edward III, membrane 14.

[1377.] Whereas Geoffrey Chaucer, controller of the custom and subsidies of wools, hides and woolfells and other customable things in the port of London, is often occupied on the king's service in remote parts so that he cannot stay in person upon the exercise of his office, and has deputed Thomas de Evesham to exercise the same in his absence; the king wills that Thomas may do so, and may write the rolls of the office with his own hand, during Geoffrey's pleasure.

By bill of the treasurer.[2]

Owing to the fact that all the early Patent Rolls (with most of the records prior to Charles I) have been sent away in order that they may be out of danger from air-raids, it has not been possible for me to obtain copies of these patents. A search of the Chancery Warrants, however, resulted in finding the two documents which are printed below; the first is dated June 8, 1374, but the second is without date. These documents are as follows:

Chancery Warrants. Ser. I. File 437. No. 30146.

Edwardus, Dei gr*a*cia Rex Angl*ie et* Franc*ie*, *et* Dom*in*us Hiber*nie*, Dilec*to et* fideli nos*t*ro Joh*ann*i Knyuet, Cancellario nos*t*ro, sal*ut*em. Cum

[1] *Calendar of the Patent Rolls*, 1370–1374, p. 449.

[2] *Ibid.*, 1374–1377, p. 462. The patent is not dated, but the regnal year limits it to the period from January 25, 1377, to June 21, 1377.

concesserim*us* dil*ecto* nobis Galfrido Chaucer officia tam Contrarotulatoris custume *et* subsidii lanar*um*, corior*um*, *et* pellium lanutar*um*, quam Contrarotulatoris parue custume vinor*um* ac trium denariorum de libra necnon pannor*um et* aliar*um* mercandisar*um* quar*um*cumque custumabilium *per* mercatores tam indigenas quam alienigenas nob*is* debitor*um* in portu London*ie*, h*ab*enda quamdiu nobis placuerit, percipiendo in officiis illis tantum quantum alii contrarotulatores custumar*um* huiusmodi in portu *predicto* hactenus percipere consueuerunt: Ita quod idem Galfridus rotulos suos dicta officia tangentes manu sua propria scribat *et* continue moretur ibidem *et* omnia que ad officia illa pertinent in propria persona sua *et* non per substitutum suum faciat *et* exequatur: Volentes quod tam altera pars sigilli nostri quod dicitur coket quam altera pars alterius sigilli nostri pro paruis custumis deputati in portu *predicto* in custodia *predicti* Galfridi remaneant quamdiu officia habuerit supradicta, vobis mandamus quod literas inde sub magno sigillo nostro in forma debita fieri faciatis. Datum sub priuato sigillo nostro apud Westmonasterium, viij die Junii anno regni nostri Anglie quadragesimo octauo, *et* Francie tricesimo quinto.

Chancery Warrants. Ser. I. File 1577.

Soit fait Commissioñ souz le grant seal a Thomas Euesham Citein de Loundres destre lieutenant Geffrei Chaucer Contreroulour de la grande custume *et* de la petite el . . . en . . . du dit Geffrei tanque come plerra au Roi *et* au dit Geffrei.

leuesque de Wircestre[1] Tresorer dengleterre

It will be observed that according to both the patent of June 8, 1374, abstracted above and the Chancery warrant of the same date, Chaucer was appointed controller of the petty custom as well as controller of the custom and subsidy of wools, etc. In this respect these documents are in agreement with the Exchequer document of June 8, 1374, printed as No. 82 of the *Life-Records*. Another patent of June 8, 1374, however, printed as No. 81 of the *Life-Records*, grants to Chaucer only the controllership of the custom and subsidy of wools. And the matter is further complicated by the fact that the note appended to Document 82 of the *Life-Records*, though the document itself grants to Chaucer both controllerships, reads:

Et predictus Galfridus, presens in Curia xij° die Junij dicto anno xlviij°, prestitit sacramentum de bene et fideliter se habendo *in officio predicto* [italics mine] quamdiu, etc.

[1] Henry Wakefield, Bishop of Worcester, was appointed treasurer of the exchequer on January 11, 1377, was reappointed on June 26, 1377, and was superseded by Thomas de Brantingham, Bishop of Exeter, on July 19, 1377 (*Calendar of the Patent Rolls*, 1374–1377, p. 400; *ibid.*, 1377–1381, pp. 3, 7).

Did Chaucer actually receive the office of controller of the petty custom in 1374, or did he receive only the office of controller of the custom and subsidy of wools? If he exercised the office of controller of the petty custom during the reign of Edward III, it was for a short period only, for John de Oxton was appointed to the office on April 1, 1375.[1] Unfortunately, the Customs Accounts, which ought to settle the question, do not name the controllers of the petty custom between June 8, 1374, and April 1, 1375. Between December 24, 1372, and March 25, 1375, there are no entries in regard to the petty custom. For the period from March 25, 1375, to April 23, 1375, no controller is named, but only Ric. Lyonns of London, farmer of the petty custom.[2]

From the evidence we have it seems impossible to decide whether Chaucer received both controllerships in 1374 or only the controllership of the custom and subsidy of wools. Kirk's opinion, that he received only the latter office in 1374, was based chiefly on the fact that the only patent of which Kirk had knowledge, Document 81 of the *Life-Records*, grants to Chaucer only the controllership of the custom and subsidy of wools.[3] But inasmuch as we now have a patent of the same date (that abstracted at the beginning of the present article) which grants to Chaucer both controllerships, we have less reason to doubt that he actually exercised both offices for some months in the years 1374 and 1375. The words "in officio

[1] *Calendar of the Patent Rolls*, 1374–1377, p. 100.

[2] During the period from April 23, 1375, to August 24, 1375, Ric. Fraunceys and Robert de Sarton are named as collectors, and John de Exton as controller. During the period from August 24, 1375, to October 1, 1375, Robert de Sarton and John de Ilkyngham are named as collectors, and John de Exton as controller. During the period from October 1, 1375, to February 20, 1376, Nicholas Potyn, Thomas Culham, and John Oxewyk are named as controllers. These data (from Declared Accounts, Customs, Roll 9), as well as the Chancery warrants printed above, I have obtained through the agency of Miss K. S. Martin of London, who has been a valuable assistant to me in this and other work that involved a search of the public records. The data in regard to the controllers of the petty custom which are contained in the Patent Rolls agree substantially with those given above from the Customs Accounts except that the Patent Roll (or at least the *Calendar*) gives the name John de Oxton (see preceding note) where the Customs Accounts give the name John de Exton. Nicholas Potyn was appointed to the office on October 14, 1375; Thomas de Culham on November 8, 1375; and John Oxwyk in [?] November, 1375 (the patent is not dated, but the year is 49 Edward III, and the other patents in the same membrane range between November 7 and December 3); see *Calendar of the Patent Rolls*, 1374–1377, pp. 174, 191, 192. In regard to Richard Lyons, named in the Customs Accounts from March 25, 1375, to April 23, 1375, as farmer of the petty custom, abundant and interesting information may be found in the *Calendar of the Patent Rolls*, 1370–1374 and 1374–1377.

[3] See *Life-Records of Chaucer*, pp. xxiii and 192, note.

predicto" which occur in the note appended to Document 82 are certainly not conclusive evidence to the contrary.

The fact that the undated Chancery Warrant printed above refers to Chaucer as "Contreroulour de la grande custume et de la petite" might seem at first sight additional evidence that Chaucer exercised both controllerships between June 8, 1374, and April 1, 1375. The signature of the Bishop of Worcester, however, proves that this document cannot belong to the period mentioned, for the bishopric of Worcester was in voidance during the period named, William de Lenne (or Lynne) having died November 18, 1373, and his successor, Henry Wakefield, not having been appointed till September 12, 1375.[1] His signature as treasurer enables us to date the warrant definitely within the period from January 11, 1377, to July 19, 1377 (see note 1, p. 50).

Thomas de Evesham, whom the undated patent of 1377, abstracted above, names as the person Chaucer has appointed as his deputy in the controllership of the custom and subsidy of wools, and whom the Chancery warrant of 1377 names as Chaucer's "lieutenant," was a substantial merchant of London whose name appears frequently in contemporary records. On January 24, 1379, he was associated with a large number of other citizens in making a loan to the city, his share being 5 marks.[2] On July 31, 1384, he was one of those summoned from the wards as a Common Council.[3] On July 18, 1385, March 28, 1386, and August 31, 1388, he was among those summoned to consult with the mayor in regard to the interests of the city or the realm.[4]

We may hope that, when the public records are once more accessible in their entirety, it may be possible to obtain additional light on these documents.

SAMUEL MOORE

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[1] Le Neve, *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, L. 1716, p. 297; Wakefield made profession of obedience on October 3, 1375, and was consecrated on October 28, 1375. The voidance of the bishopric of Worcester during the period with which we are directly concerned is abundantly proved by references in the Patent Rolls; see *Calendar of the Patent Rolls*, 1370–1374, 1374–1377, Indexes.

[2] R. R. Sharpe, *Calendar of Letter Books of the City of London*, H, pp. 123–125.

[3] *Ibid.*, H, p. 237.

[4] *Ibid.*, H, pp. 269 f., 279 ff., 332 f. For other references to Evesham see *ibid.*, H, p. 345; *Calendar of the Patent Rolls*, 1361–1364, p. 514; *Calendar of the Close Rolls*, 1374–1377, p. 556; 1377–1381, pp. 61, 200.

THE WEST MIDLAND PROSE PSALTER 90:10

In the *Archiv*, CXXXIV, 132, Professor Logeman fails to find adequate explanation for the figure in the following passage, "Our ȝeres shul þenchen as þe lob 'as the spider.'" He notes that in my *Middle English Reader* I have quoted the Vulgate to explain the English words, but objects that I did not use the variant reading *gravel* of one MS, although he finally admits that the latter does not account for the figure of the West Midland Psalter.

Indeed, Professor Logeman was clearly on the wrong track in supposing that the variant *gravel* will help us. The Vulgate *sicut aranea* is based on the Septuagint ὡς ἀράχνη, as he notes, while the Septuagint is also supported by the Syriac version of the Psalms. Thus the West Midland Psalter follows its original correctly, while the variant *gravel* shows the corruption of Latin *aranea* 'spider'—*arena* (*harena*) 'sand.' Besides, the Septuagint-Vulgate was the reading usually followed in English versions, as by the Vespasian, the Cambridge, the OE metrical version, the Lambeth, the Rolle translation, the ME metrical text (*Surtees Soc.*, three MSS), the two Wyclifite versions, and the West Midland text, which we are discussing. Yet all this needs explanation today, especially since our modern version has no such figure in this place.

The comparison of man's life to the spider not only has a basis in original sources, but was commonly accepted by mediaeval writers and explained as indicating transitoriness or vanity. It was so explained by St. Jerome, *Breviarium in Psalmos* (Migne 26, 1159):

> Quomodo aranea quasi mittit fila, et huc illucque discurrit, et texit tota die, et labor quidem grandis est, sed effectus nullus est, sic et vita hominum, divitias appetimus, procreamus filios, laboramus, in regna sustollimur, et omnia facimus, et non intelligimus, quia araneae telam teximus.

So the English Bede, *In Psalmorum Librum Exegesis* (Migne 93, 966):

> *Sicut aranea*, id est, in corruptibilibus laboramus, et vana et inutilia conteximus, velut aranea.[1]

[1] Other Fathers might be cited, as Haymo of Halberstadt, *Expositio in Psalmos* (Migne 116, 506); Remigius, *Ennarrationes in Psalmos* (Migne 131, 622); St. Bruno of Herbipolis, *Expositio Psalmorum* (Migne 142, 336); St. Bruno of the Carthusians, *Expositio in Psalmos* (Migne 152, 1122); St. Bruno Astensis, *Expositio in Psalmos* (Migne 164, 1051); Oddo Astensis, *Expositio in Psalmos* (Migne 165, 1256).

Or we may compare the English of Richard Rolle, *Commentary on the Psalter*, the passage in question:

As þe erayn makes vayn webbes for to take fleghis wiþ gile, swa oure ȝeris ere occupyde in ydell and swykil kastis about erthly thynge, and passis wiþouten froyt of goed werke, waste in ydyll thynkynge and unnayt dede.

But the use of the figure of the spider, whether original in this passage or not, is not strange, since it is found in other parts of the Bible. Thus in Psalm 39:12 the Vulgate has:

A fortitudine manus tuae ego defeci in increpationibus: propter iniquitatem corripuisti hominem. Et tabescere fecisti sicut araneam animam ejus: verumtamen vane conturbatur omnis homo.

Parts of both of these parallelisms are united in our modern version, and the figure has been changed (Ps. 39:11):

When thou with rebukes dost correct man for iniquity, thou makest his beauty to consume away like a moth: surely every man is vanity.

In both Job and Isaiah the same figure is also used. Job 8:13–14 reads in the Vulgate:

Sic viae omnium, qui obliviscuntur Deum, et spes hypocritae peribit. Non ei placebit vecordia sua, et sicut tela aranearum fiducia ejus.

Isaiah, arraigning the wicked, says (59:5–6):

Ova aspidum ruperunt, et telas araneae texuerunt: qui comederit de ovis eorum, morietur, et quod confotum est, erumpet in regulum. Telae eorum non erunt in vestimentum, neque operientur operibus suis: opera eorum opera inutilia, et opus iniquitatis in manibus eorum.

The evident corruption of *aranea* to *harena* (*arena*) in early Latin Psalters need not be traced. Certain editions of the Vulgate, however, refer to Ecclesiasticus 18:8, a passage to which Professor Logeman also calls attention. There the years of man's life are likened to a drop of water (*gutta aquae maris*) and to a grain of sand (*calculus arenae*). Such a reference and confusion of words in an early Latin text are sufficient to account for the Canterbury Psalter reading *swa sand*, OE *grytte* above the line in Vespasian and Cambridge, and *gravel* in the second text of the West Midland Psalter. But, as noted above, the latter cannot be the original reading of which *aranea* is a corruption, as is clear from the readings of the Septuagint and the Syriac.

The modern English rendering of the comparison for man's life "as a tale that is told," naturally does not rest on the Septuagint-Vulgate version. It is based on a Hebrew text in which there is no word for 'spider,' but a root, *Hegeh*, meaning 'to moan, growl, speak, muse.' From this the noun in the comparison would mean 'a moaning, speaking, sighing,' 'a fleeting sound.' This reading was known to Jerome and adopted in his version of the Psalms, the Vulgate (Migne 28, 1262), in the following form:

Omnes enim dies nostri transierunt in furore tuo: consumpsimus annos nostros quasi sermonem loquens.

It is perhaps best explained by Petrus Lombardus in his *Commentarium in Psalmos* (Migne 191, 844):

Anni nostri sicut aranea meditabantur. Hieronymus et recentiores aliter signant distinctionem. Accipiunt enim active verbum superioris versus, ubi dicebamus *defecimus*, et copulant sequentibus, hoc pacto: *consumpsimus annos nostros, quasi sermonem.* Addit tamen Hieronymus, explicationis sensus gratia, *loquens.* Alii non addunt. In Hebr. HEGEH, inclinatur a radice HAGAH, quae interdum significat *meditari.* Sed vocabulum *aranea*, cur a Septuaginta sit positum, explicat Hieronymus ad Cyprianum: "Pro *sermone loquentis*, Septuaginta *meditationem araneae* transtulerunt. Quomodo enim loquentis sermo praetervolat, ita et opus araneae incassum texitur. De quo super persona hereticorum scriptum est in Isaia: *telam araneae texunt* (Isa., chap. 59). Quae parva et levia potest capere animalia, et muscas, culices, et caetera hujusmodi; a fortioribus autem rumpitur; instar levium in Ecclesia simpliciumque qui eorum decipiunter erroribus, cum viros in fidei veritate robustos non valeant obtinere."[1]

The Luther text follows the Hebrew as we should expect, rendering the comparison: "Wir bringen unsere jahre zu, wie ein Geschwätz." The English version of Coverdale, on which all later English renderings are based in this passage, reads:

For when thou art angrie, all oure dayes are gone, we brynge oure yeares to an ende, as it were a tayle that is tolde.

OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

[1] For a more modern note explaining the texts at length, see Rosenmüller, *Scholia in Vetus Testamentum, Psalms*, 1520–21, as of course Perowne, Cheyne, and Briggs.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

The Poems of Edgar Allen Poe. Edited by KILLIS CAMPBELL. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1917. Pp. lxvi+332.

The appearance of this volume is an important event in the annals of Poe criticism, and indeed in American literary scholarship. For no other American poet is so excellent a volume available. The elaborate apparatus includes a judicious summary of the facts of Poe's life, discussions of the canon of Poe's poems, a very able account of the text and of revisions of it by Poe, an astonishingly illuminating account of Poe's indebtedness to other poets, and a summary of the various attitudes of critics towards Poe—which last, whatever it does for Poe's reputation, doesn't add laurels to many of the critics or to criticism in general. Then follows probably the most thoroughly competent text of Poe yet printed, and voluminous and invaluable notes. These notes excel in placing the poems naturally in groups according to theme, in giving detailed accounts of sources of inspiration and circumstances of composition, and in citing parallels to other poets. Perhaps sometimes it might be made clearer that these parallels represent romantic commonplaces rather than sources. For instance, the line ("The Valley of Unrest," 16)

Around the misty Hebrides!

is related to "Wordsworth's well-known lines in *The Solitary Reaper*," but the reader gets no information that the Hebrides had been a new *ultima Thule* for many poets of the eighteenth century, probably under the influence of "Lycidas," 155, to which, as much as to Wordsworth, Poe seems here indebted. In general the parallels show Poe as a much more bookish poet than he has generally been thought, though practically never discreditably bookish. As a whole the notes are admirable. That on *hyacinth* (p. 202) could have been improved by using a standard Greek dictionary on the Greek etymon, or even by consulting Murray, instead of quoting Verity and Kent. Perhaps other similarly petty improvements could be made, but the annotator gives so much that it is hardly just to ask more. The volume seems somewhat to neglect Poe's versification; at least the reviewer has been a bit surprised not to see among the abundant bibliographical references that occur throughout the notes, any reference to Professor F. Olivero's thorough study of one phase of the problem in his essay "Il Ritornello e la ripetizione in E. A. Poe" (pp. 31–77 of *Studi sul romanticismo inglese*, Bari, 1914).

Professor Campbell is to be highly congratulated for his most careful and judicious work.

GEORGE SHERBURN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVI *June 1918* NUMBER 2

LONGFELLOW'S ATTITUDE TOWARD GOETHE

In December, 1836, Longfellow took up his work as Smith Professor of Modern Languages at Harvard. This was a critical period in the political and social history of America. On all sides were signs of expansion. The difficulties of physical and political existence having been surmounted, the conditions of life became easier and idealistic impulses were developed. There sprang up new ideas in religion, education, literature, and art. Religious life was marked by more liberal currents, especially by the growth of Unitarianism in New England. The rising tide of moral sentiment swept along great reforms in social life, such as the temperance movement and the abolition of African slavery. The people who had looked to England for guidance in intellectual and literary lines began to cast their eyes to a wider horizon, including the continent of Europe. The German institutions came in for a large share of attention. The efficiency of their schools, the soundness of their learning, their intellectual accomplishments, found zealous admirers and advocates among the little group of scholars who were familiar with them. German literature especially claimed increasing attention. The rapid growth of this interest was phenomenal. It was a significant feature of the culture that was developing in America. Up to 1815 there was almost no knowledge here of German literature. There was scarcely a book to be found in New England for the study of the German language, when George Ticknor wanted to take it up.[1]

[1] *Life, Letters and Journals of George Ticknor*, Boston, I, 11–12.

Some little impulse to the study of German was given by Mme de Staël's *De l'Allemagne*, and a more powerful stimulation came through the impact of the young American scholars, led by George Ticknor and Edward Everett, who came back from German universities enthusiastic over what they had learned. They formed centers of influence in New England, and in some sporadic instances in the South and West.[1] German was introduced as a subject of study at Harvard in 1825, with Charles Follen as instructor. He became professor of German five years later, continuing until 1835. Harvard Library had already received quite a collection of German books, consisting of many brought home by Edward Everett, also the library of Professor Ebeling, of Hamburg, purchased for Harvard, and of thirty volumes of Goethe's works, presented by him through his friend, Joseph Coggswell.[2]

A strong influence in favor of German literature came through the critical writings of Carlyle. His works became popular among the intellectual classes in this country, who thus became acquainted with some of the most famous German writers. Lowell and his little group of college friends read Carlyle in college and were fascinated with his writings.

Professor S. H. Goodnight shows by his survey[3] of American periodicals how rapidly the interest in German subjects increased between 1820–40. But the friendliness to German literature was not altogether unanimous. There were grave doubts expressed about the religious and moral views of these works, and American scholars, who were known to be delving in this new domain, did not escape suspicion. Some bitter denunciation of the spirit and influence of German writings appeared in literary reviews of this time. Even scholars who were best prepared to judge in such a matter were divided in their opinions. The strife centered largely about Goethe. As he was recognized as the most conspicuous German writer, so his character and his works were subjected to the sharpest scrutiny, being alternately assailed and defended.

[1] At University of Virginia and at Lane Seminary, Cincinnati.

[2] For gift of Goethe's works, cf. *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, XXV, 15–16.

[3] *German Literature in American Magazines Prior to 1846*, by S. H. Goodnight, University of Wisconsin Bulletin, No. 188, 1907.

"Carlyle's books were reprinted in America . . . . as fast as they were written. Lowell read them attentively," etc. E. E. Hale's *Lowell and His Friends*, p. 21.

It was just at this critical period that Longfellow began his service at Harvard, undertaking the most prominent position in modern languages in this country. His office kept him at Harvard for eighteen years, until 1854, by which time German literature was firmly established in public favor. As he occupied this influential place during the two decades when American ideals were being so strongly molded, it is of special interest to inquire what was his feeling toward this vexing question of German literature, more definitely, what was his attitude toward Goethe.

Longfellow was in Europe on his first visit, 1826–29, during Goethe's lifetime, and at the time when the great poet received Americans frequently at his home in Weimar. Göttingen, where Longfellow studied for several months in 1829, was only a short distance from Weimar, so that he could easily have paid homage to the prince of German poets, as several of his compatriots did.[1] Probably his failure to improve this opportunity was owing to his imperfect mastery of German at that time, as well as to his sudden call home earlier than he expected. So it happened that the prospective professor, who was destined to be the foremost interpreter to the American public of German life for his generation, did not enjoy the inspiration of a personal acquaintance with the great Weimarian.

Two reviews of Goethe's works, which appeared in the years 1838 and 1839 in prominent American journals, express very plainly the contradictory opinions that were held of his character and writings. They were both by scholars thoroughly familiar with the subject they were discussing. One of these reviewers was George Bancroft, the famous historian. He had studied at Göttingen and had enjoyed a personal acquaintance with Goethe. Yet on his first reading of Goethe's works, he was offended by their taste, and made a strong comment upon them in his journal.[2] This first impression seems to have remained with him, although the tone is more moderate in a review in the *North American*, of 1824. But in this later review, in the *Christian Examiner*, of Boston, 1839, he makes a scathing denunciation of Goethe's character. He will not

[1] *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, XXV, 19–23, mentions visits by William Emerson, brother of Ralph W., George H. Calvert, H. E. Dwight, and several more.

[2] *The Life and Letters of George Bancroft*, by M. A. DeW. Howe, Scribners, 1908, p. 38.

concede to him either moral character or poetic excellence. He said he was insincere, lax in principles and practice, and imitative in his art. Longfellow's comment on this article was to call it a "violent article against Goethe," which he evidently did not approve.[1]

The other review was from the pen of John L. Motley, another eminent historian who had studied in Germany.[2] He takes up the charges that were commonly hurled at Goethe, and defends him against indifferentism and immorality. In regard to the latter point, he says:

> In so far as this charge rests on the want of a distinct moral aim in his works, we regard him as fully justified, on the ground . . . . that morals and esthetics constitute two different provinces. It is absurd to demand of an artist that his work should inculcate a moral. But on other grounds we do not know that Goethe can be entirely justified from the charge of "lukewarmness of moral sentiments."

In a later article,[3] which is a sort of continuation of the above, Motley speaks more of the properties of Goethe's mind and character. What he finds pre-eminent is his universalism. "We consider all of these excellencies and defects of Goethe," (quoting his words) "as all forming parts of one great characteristic. This characteristic we have ventured to express by the term universalism." He characterizes Faust as the

> eternal type of a mind in which the equilibrium between human ambition and human ability is destroyed; a mind which is disgusted with the insufficiency of all human knowledge. . . . . It is a mind which has refused to piece out with faith, the deficiencies of knowledge; in which the silver link, call it hope, faith, trust, or aught else by which alone the finite may be connected with the infinite, has been broken.

The gist of Motley's articles is here quoted, because his views were evidently shared by Longfellow and met his approval. Of the last one he speaks distinctly as follows:[4] "Motley has said in it the best thing on Faust (so far as it goes) that I have ever heard or read." His agreement with Motley in the first article will appear later.

These two articles of the years 1838 and 1839 are rather typical of the views expressed concerning Goethe. The New England

[1] *Journal and Correspondence*, I, 340.

[2] *New York Review*, 1838.

[3] *Ibid.*, V.

[4] *Journal and Correspondence*, I, 338.

conscience was offended by his liberality. Even his warmest defenders felt obliged to gloss over his defects. Longfellow did not take a prominent part in this forensic combat. But in the quieter way of the professor, by his lectures on German literature and in his poetry and romance, he was unobtrusively insinuating the spirit of German poetry into the American mind.

His activities during his term of office were divided between his teaching and writing. In both functions he showed his zeal for German literature. As a professor he was required to give lectures on literature. They covered a broad field, embracing even classic as well as modern writers.[1] The subjects for his course in the summer term of 1837, consisting of twelve lectures, show six of them devoted to German literature, of which three treat of Goethe's life and writings. No other German author, not even his favorite, Jean Paul Richter, received so much attention. These lectures, as explained by his biographer,[2] his brother, were the so-called "oral" lectures, in which the professor read passages which he had translated from the foreign works and commented on them. For those on Faust he had an interleaved copy of the drama, on which he wrote translations of choice passages. He makes rather numerous references in his *Journal and Correspondence* to his lectures on *Faust*. He writes to his father, August 23, 1837, that he would commence the autumn term with lectures on Goethe's *Faust*. He had already referred to his lectures on Goethe in the previous term. June 7, 1838, he was reading *Die Wahlverwandtschaften* and writing a lecture on Goethe's character and work. In the autumn term of 1839, he spent apparently more than two months on *Faust*, as there is a reference on September 8 to an "introductory lecture," and on November 13, he thought over his "last lecture on *Faust* for tomorrow."

Some of these lectures were woven into his romance, *Hyperion*, from which his sentiments regarding German literature are clear. The chapter on Goethe,[3] while not in just the form of his lecture, is doubtless expressive of his attitude toward him. It is put into the form of a dialogue between Paul Flemming and the Baron. The harsh criticisms of Goethe from the British critics are mentioned. The points for and against him are noted, with the balance leaning

[1] *Ibid.*, I, 261. [2] *Ibid.*, I, 286. [3] *Hyperion*, Book II, chap. 8.

toward indulgence rather than condemnation. Every stroke against him is parried by some justification. His so-called indifferentism is justified as his calm, philosophic frame of mind in the midst of turbulent elements. His sensuality is explained as his realism in depicting emotions according to nature. He was an artist, who describes life as he perceives it, even the immoral side. Menzel's attack on him is accounted too savage and is unjustifiable, as it is inconsistent in its blame. The great poet, subjected to the attacks of petty writers, reminds the Baron of the sick lion, whom even the jackass abuses in his weakness. Both speakers agree that he was a glorious specimen of a man. He reminds the American of Benjamin Franklin, in his love of science, his philosophic nature, and his practical sense. Heine's characterization of Goethe, in his *Romantische Schule*, is quoted with approbation, in which he was likened to the giant oak, whose branches spread themselves over the forest of smaller trees. He towered majestically aloft, stretching out toward heaven, until the stars looked like his golden fruit.

From this chapter it is clear that Longfellow, while not insensible to Goethe's faults, was prone to excuse and pass over them. His viewpoint is explained in the chapter on "Lives of Scholars,"[1] in which he says: "We must pardon much to men of genius. A delicate organization renders them keenly susceptible to pain and pleasure. And then they idealize everything; and in the moonlight of fancy, even the deformity of vice seems beautiful." This is the view taken by Motley in the above-mentioned article (p. 4) in the *New York Review*, with whom Longfellow must have been in agreement.

The gentle, indirect way in the form of a romance by which Longfellow introduced Goethe to the public reached a larger audience than the more learned articles and reviews. It is difficult for us today to realize the immense popularity of his *Hyperion* in the early days. But its emotionalism, its romantic atmosphere, the intimate, unconventional, self-revealing style of the poet, appealed powerfully to the community. Professor J. M. Hart[2] emphasizes this renown, saying that *Hyperion* represented German literature to America in the forties and fifties of the last century. "It influenced the New

[1] *Hyperion*, Book I, chap. 7.

[2] *The Nation*, Jan. 9, 1908.

England mind profoundly. It used to be a Harvard classic before the war." Since that was the case, great credit is due to Longfellow for the more favorable reception which was gradually accorded to Goethe in this country.

Another touchstone of his relation to Goethe is supplied by his judgment of Menzel's attack on the Weimar poet. Menzel's *History of German Literature* was translated in 1840 by Longfellow's friend, Professor C. C. Felton. Longfellow knew of Felton's work and probably encouraged him in it, although he knew that it contained the bitterest attack on Goethe. Did Longfellow then approve of this denunciation? We can answer that question by his own direct and unequivocal statement, which he made in a review[1] of Felton's work. He called Menzel an "assailant of the literary idol of Germany," and the "champion of Goethe's foes." "We are not now called upon or disposed to take sides in the contest," he continues, "it is sufficient for us to say, that we condemn the violence of the author, and dissent from his opinion." After commending the work in general, he makes special reservation as follows:

> In saying this much, we do not mean to say that we coincide with Mr. Menzel in all his views, especially in his estimate of many of the great men of Germany; in our opinion his remarks upon Goethe, Johannes Mueller and Voss betray too much of personal and malignant feeling to admit the supposition of their being fair criticisms.

Quite the opposite was his estimate of Lewes' *Life of Goethe.* Under date of December 16, 1855,[2] he wrote of this work as "a very clever and judicious book. The best we have had as yet, giving the great German as he really was."

Numerous allusions to Goethe's works in Longfellow's *Journal and Correspondence* show his continued interest. On one occasion[3] he is reading *Faust* and comparing several translations. On another[4] he was with Sumner and Hillard and had a "long discussion on Goethe—his art and poetry."[5] He heard Emerson's lecture on Goethe, which he calls good, but not pre-eminent. Under date of June 8, 1846, he writes: "In the morning before going to college, I read the first part of Goethe's 'Italienische Reise.' . . . . It is

[1] *New York Review*, 1840.

[2] *Journal and Correspondence*, II, 299.

[3] Dec. 8, 1839. [4] Feb. 9, 1846. [5] Jan. 22, 1846.

written in his usual lucid, simple style." His lectures on *Faust* were given frequently, probably every year. Here is an entry from his *Journal*, which reveals the conscientious professor:[1] "Today a new class in college wanting to read *Faust*. And I cannot in conscience say No. Inclination to do everything for the youngster prompts me to say Yes; accordingly I do say Yes." May 27, 1851, he writes: "Closed the first part of *Faust* at lecture. I am more than ever struck with the greatness of this poem. Next week I shall take up the second part of *Faust*, with extracts—the first scene and the whole of the last act." There is a similar reference in the last year of his professorship.

Thus far Longfellow's relation to Goethe has been considered from the external standpoint, in such expressions of opinion as Longfellow made in public and private. This evidence is conclusive of his friendly feeling toward Goethe. But the exposition of his relationship would not be complete without taking into consideration the intimate sympathies of the two poets with one another as revealed in the spirit of their works.

Competent critics of American literature, such as Barrett Wendell,[2] George E. Woodberry,[3] Paul More,[4] and others, concede to Longfellow the credit of interpreting the spirit of European culture to America. Wendell, after referring to his faithful service as professor at Harvard, emphasizes the larger work accomplished by the poet: "Longfellow's true mission was not to struggle with unwilling hearers; it was rather to set forth in words which should find their way to the eager readers of a continent the spirit as distinguished from the letter of the literatures with which as a professor he conscientiously dealt so long."

Higginson notices that "Longfellow was to all Americans, at that time, one of the two prime influences through which the treasures of German literature and especially of German romance were opened to English readers."[5]

[1] Mar. 29, 1850.

[2] Wendell's *Literary History of America*, p. 381.

[3] Cf. *Harper's Magazine*, CVI, 427.

[4] Cf. *Shelburne Essays*, V, 139.

[5] T. W. Higginson's *Old Cambridge*, p. 133.

As regards German literature, Longfellow was able to interpret its spirit, for he found himself in vital sympathy with it.[1] At a time when his heart was peculiarly susceptible he was brought into touch with German poetry, and he became so imbued with its spirit, that he was transformed by its influence. The "treasures" which he imported into American literature enriched his own mind and broadened his outlook upon life.

A great change is observable in his poetry after 1836. His early poems show a refinement of form, but are artificial, cold and impersonal in sentiment. But after that year his poetry was suffused with feeling. It touches the deep and instinctive passions of humanity, now stirring to action with its vigorous thought, again expressive of the tender longings and aspirations of the soul. The poet's sympathies for the joys and sorrows of mankind have been enlarged. Henceforth his vocation as a poet is secure, for he has found the source of all true poetry and has been moved by the deepest emotions.

The new spirit in his poetry corresponds to the great change in his life which occurred in Germany. He went abroad in the early summer of 1835, accompanied by his young wife, with every promise of happiness. But by the unexpected death of his wife in Rotterdam in November of that year, his hopes were shattered. At one blow his life was shaken to its depths. His plans of life were seriously interrupted, his spirit was broken. He was left alone in a foreign land, forced to break with the past, to enter upon the future with uncertainty and gloom. Whither should he look for support? Not to his friends, for they were far distant from him; not to his hopes, for they were blasted; not to his philosophy, which was inadequate for such soul-stirring experiences. He turned for relief to the study of German poetry, "buried himself in books," working his way up from the mediaeval minnesingers to the "sunny lands" of the contemporary bards.[2] The gradual recovery of his normal disposition was effected by the restorative influence of German ideals. His religious and intellectual character was broadened and his courage aroused by communion with the German poets. In the sad months

[1] Cf. H. S. White, *Goethe in Amerika*, "Kein englischer Dichter ist so von dem Geiste der poetischen Seite der deutschen Literatur erfuellt wie Longfellow," *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, V, 234.

[2] *Hyperion*, end of Book I.

at Heidelberg, Goethe, Jean Paul, and Uhland were favorite companions of his lonely hours. He gave also large attention to the Romantic poets, Tieck, Novalis, des Knaben Wunderhorn, Mueller, and the rest, and there are many marks of their influence in his poetry. But conceding to Romanticism a strong impulse upon him, it did not dominate him. He learned from the Romantic poets that the simple, unaffected, spontaneous outburst of emotion is the very essence of poetry. But his American spirit, his practical mind, could not be satisfied with their visionary ideals. He turned for guidance rather to Goethe, with whose principles he was in deeper sympathy. By nature and training there was much in his character that corresponded to Goethe's. He came to him therefore for support and found in his teachings encouragement to rise superior to his sorrow. The account of his bitter struggle with his grief up to his restoration through the principle of action is related in *Hyperion*. That book testifies to the benignant forces which effected his restoration and confirms the thought of Goethe's guidance. It was suggested by *Wilhelm Meister*,[1] which it strongly resembles in theme and plan. Goethe's hero, striving for self-cultivation, sets out on his travels, on which he is brought into association with a troupe of actors, with the nobility, and with all sorts of people. The talented, enthusiastic young man, whose artistic temperament is almost too pronounced for practical purposes, is led to a more sensible view of life by associating with men of worldly experience, and finally by his attachment for the calm, well-poised Natalie. The work gives an epitome of the social conditions in Germany at the close of the eighteenth century. It relates many peculiar incidents and the views on various subjects which occupied public attention. It was the clearest revelation at the time it appeared of the author's worldly wisdom.

Similarly *Hyperion* portrays the career of a young man who is groping after improvement.[2] It is Longfellow's self-revelation. In his own words, "it is a sincere book, showing the passage of a morbid mind into a purer and healthier state."[3] The hero, Paul Flemming,

[1] The influence of *Wilhelm Meister* upon Longfellow is strongly stated by Professor F. L. Pattee in the article, "Longfellow and German Romance," *Poet Lore*, 1906, pp. 59–77.

[2] Cf. Morin's *Les Sources de l'œuvre de Longfellow*, pp. 214–15. He says: "Le hêros, Paul Flemming, qui n'est autre que l'auteur lui-même, est une sorte de *Wilhelm Meister*."

[3] Letter to Greene, June 10, 1841. Given in *Journal and Correspondence*.

has a refined, sensitive nature, as compared with the good-natured Baron, the man-of-the-world type, whose companionship with Flemming is most beneficent. But more important than his influence is finally the recuperative effect of the friendship with Mary Ashburton. The plan is imitative of Goethe also, bringing in many incidents and discussions which are digressions from the main interests. But he lacked the skill to fit them in as aptly as Goethe. Its style is patterned after Jean Paul, as the critics quickly discerned. Its mood is Romantic, showing how deeply affected the author was by the Romantic writers. The "atmosphere" is the chief thing, with only a slender plot. But while the author is swayed by these various influences, when he comes to the main point, to the message of his work, he manifests his relationship to Goethe. The turning-point in his hero's restoration is furnished by the motto on the chapel wall at St. Gilgen:[1] "Look not mournfully into the Past. It comes not back again. Wisely improve the Present. It is thine. Go forth to meet the shadowy Future, without fear, and with a manly heart." This is the philosophy of Goethe. It is the message that Wilhelm Meister receives in the scroll of the secret lodge, although it is there hidden under oracular expression: "Art is long, life short, judgment difficult, the opportunity fleeting. Acting is easy, thinking is hard; to act according to reflection is uncomfortable. . . . . The heights attract us, but not the steps; the summit in view, we gladly wander in the plain."[2] This is the keynote of Goethe's philosophy, most fully revealed in his *Faust*. Longfellow found it inspiring advice, which he was glad to act upon.

But Longfellow's gift was more lyrical than narrative. So his best efforts are the songs and short poems, many of which have become household words. No other American poet has equalled him in the power to put in beautiful, emotional phrases the common, homely sentiments. In these lyrics is the clearest revelation of his soul. We turn to them, then, for the study of the poet's inner life, and find in them many evidences of his sympathy with German ideals.

[1] Book IV, chap. 8.

[2] *Wilhelm Meister*, Book VII, chap. 9.

The first collection of his songs after his German sojourn, *Voices of the Night*, contains some of his best-known lyrics. They became popular at once. They were eagerly gathered as the best fruits that Romanticism had produced in America. The title was significant, suggestive of Novalis' *Hymnen an die Nacht*, and there were other evidences of the author's romantic mood. In the Prelude he declared the change which had come over him. He had gained a new view of life and art, had found the sources of true poetry and its themes. Its springs are in the heart. Reviewing the inclinations of his youth, his delight in the silent woodlands and in lonely musings, he bids farewell to such fancies and turns to the real objects of the poet's mind, saying:

> The land of song within thee lies,[1]
> Watered by living springs.
> . . . . . .
> Look then into thine heart, and write!
> Yes, into Life's deep stream!
> All forms of sorrow and delight,
> All solemn Voices of the Night,
> That can soothe thee or affright,
> Be these henceforth thy theme.

This thought of poetry as the ingenuous, instinctive outpouring of the heart was the foundation principle of the Romantic theory. But it was not original with them. They got it from Goethe's works, and he from Herder. Herder had announced it in his first essays, *Fragmente über die neuere deutsche Literatur*, and had put the younger poets on the right track in urging them to study the folk-songs. Goethe needed but the hint in order to come to the real essence of poetry, and henceforth his works became, according to his famous words, "parts of a great confession." In the words of Faust:

> Wenn ihr's nicht fuehlt, ihr werdet's nicht erjagen,
> Wenn es nicht aus der Seele dringt [vss. 535–36],

and later:

> Das Pergament, ist das der heil'ge Bronnen,
> Woraus ein Trunk den Durst auf ewig stillt?
> Erquickung hast du nicht gewonnen,
> Wenn sie dir nicht aus eigner Seele quillt [vss. 566–69].

[1] Cf. his words in *Hyperion:* "Glorious indeed is the world of God around us, but more glorious the world of God within us. There lies the Land of Song; there lies the poet's native land," etc.

Longfellow's discovery of this great truth, which reacted so favorably on his development as a poet, was one of the most important results of his German studies. Goethe was his guide in this path too.

The most popular song Longfellow ever wrote, the "Psalm of Life," was contained in this collection. Its reception by the public was marvellous. Its effect was like a trumpet call to action. It struck a new note in American literature, so stimulating and so wholesome, that it caught the popular feeling and rang through the English-speaking world. Its central thought is the reality of life:

> Life is real! Life is earnest!

Consequently there is need of action:

> Trust no Future, howe'er pleasant!
> Let the dead Past bury its dead!
> Act,—act in the living Present,
> Heart within and God o'erhead.

This is merely the poetic turn of the truth which he made the motto of his *Hyperion*. His using it there as the turning-point in his recovery and here in this poem, which as the title signifies was a characterization of life, shows how important it was in his mind. He regarded it as the keynote of success, the conclusion of worldly wisdom. The same sentiment in different form appears in several others of his finest poems. The "nobility of labor" is one such phrase, which he names as the lesson from Hans Sachs, the cobbler-poet. Still more clearly he puts it in "The Village Blacksmith":

> Something attempted, something done,
> Has earned a night's repose.
> . . . . . .
> Thus at the flaming forge of life
> Our fortunes must be wrought.

It is the advice he gives "To a Child":

> Still let it ever be thy pride
> To linger by the laborer's side, etc.

In his old age, in his class-day ode "Morituri Salutamus," one of the finest couplets is:

> Better like Hector in the field to die,
> Than like a perfumed Paris turn and fly.

In all of these expressions it is seen how closely akin he was to Goethe. They are like echoes of Goethe's worldly wisdom,[1] whose cornerstone was the principle of courageous action, of ceaseless striving.[2] That is the key-note of *Faust.*

> Das ist der Weisheit letzter Schluss:
> Nur der verdient sicht Freiheit wie das Leben,
> Der taeglich sie erobern muss [vss. 11574–76].

In the moral conceptions of life, the two poets were much alike. A comparison of their views will show this similarity. We turn first to *Faust,* in which is found the fullest statement of Goethe's religious life. The poem is a drama, portraying the struggle of good and evil in man. Mephistopheles is the embodiment of evil, as Faust is the representative of mankind. The outcome of the struggle is assured from the beginning. The author's belief in the rightness of things is certain that God will not condemn to perish a man who is earnestly striving. It is the Lord's assurance, in the *Prolog:*

> Ein guter Mensch in seinem dunklen Drange,
> Ist sich des rechten Weges wohl bewusst.

Positive religion has not any hold on Faust. He has put all that behind him, when he resorted to magic. Only once is he stirred by any religious feeling, and that is by the Easter chant, which reminds him of his childish reverence (vss. 771 ff.). He has no positive name for the Ultimate Cause, but is in doubt whether to call it "word," "mind," "energy," or "deed" (vss. 1224 ff.). To Gretchen's direct question, whether he believes in God (vs. 3426), he replies in effect, that feeling is all that is necessary. He did not have any strong convictions or vivid notions about the future life. He has the attitude of an agnostic toward the beyond. He was concerned about the present world and would take his chances about the hereafter. In this mood he is ready to wager with Mephistopheles, with his soul at stake.

> Das Drueben kann mich wenig kuemmern;
> Schlaegst du erst diese Welt in Truemmern,
> Die andre mag darnach entstehn.
> Aus dieser Erde quillen meine Leiden;
> Kann ich mich erst von ihnen scheiden,
> Dann mag, was will und kann, geschehn [vss. 1660–66].

[1] The *Psalm of Life* was first read to his class at Harvard at the conclusion of a lecture on Goethe, in July, 1838.

[2] Cf. *Faust,* vs. 4685; (vs. 941); vss. 11471–86.

Even to the last his eyes are fixed on this world, and he scoffs at the man who looks into eternity:

> Nach drueben ist die Aussicht uns verrannt;
> Tor! wer dorthin die Augen blinzelnd richtet,
> Sich ueber Wolken seinesgleichen dichtet!
> Er stehe fest und sehe hier sich um;
> Dem Tuechtigen ist diese Welt nicht stumm.
> Was braucht er in die Ewigkeit zu schweifen!
> . . . . . .
> Im Weiterschreiten find'er Qual und Glueck,
> Er, unbefriedigt jeden Augenblick! [11443–52].

After he has "stormed through life," wrecking one person after another (Gretchen, Valentin, their mother, Philemon, and Baucis), pursuing his sensual pleasures, there is no word of sincere repentance, no evidence of contrition. The only change at the last is that he shows some altruistic traits. He has not become entirely materialistic. Some idealism remains. This Titan of ambition, whose mighty impulse was stirred

> Zum hoechsten Dasein immerfort zu streben [vs. 4685]

conceives of a channel for his activity which will bless others, by reclaiming some territory from the sea bottom and transforming it into habitable land. His goal lies in the distant future, but fortunately it includes the welfare of others besides himself. He is saved by divine mercy, apparently by reason of this small proof of idealistic striving:

> Wer immer strebend sich bemueht,
> Den koennen wir erloesen [vss. 11936–37].

This is in brief a summary of the ethical teaching of *Faust*. It is easy to understand why such epithets as "Pagan" were hurled at Goethe, when he expressed so little of Christian belief. It explains why the New England orthodox leaders were suspicious of his influence and doubted the effect of his works on Young America. His religion seemed materialistic, vague, a refined heathenism. At best it was only deistic and took no account of Christ.

Longfellow saw the deficiency of Goethe's moral doctrines as judged by the Christian standards. He thought[1] they were a revival

[1] Letter to Ward, *Journal and Correspondence*, I, 331.

of Horace's philosophy, a pleasant Epicureanism, as expressed in his Ode to Thaliarchus:

> Dissolve frigus, ligna super foco
> Large reponens, atque benignius
> Deprome quadrimum Sabina,
> O Thaliarche, merum diota.

which is summarized by E. C. Wickham:[1] "It is midwinter. Well, pile on more logs, and bring out larger supplies of wine. When the gods will, spring will come back. Do not look forward. Each day that you get is so much gained. Enjoy it. Love and dance and play while you can, for old age is coming." This is an insufficient characterization of Goethe's ethical spirit. It leaves out of account at any rate his earnest striving for ideals. But even a modern view of his ethics, such as is given by Professor Calvin Thomas, a noted commentator of *Faust*, is not much more favorable. His comment on Faust's salvation is:

> Evidently his "striving" must be understood in a rather abstract way of his idealism, which is indeed the dominant trait of his character, but not the mainspring of all that he does. Nevertheless, that he should be saved in virtue of this quality, rather than by faith or good works, accords with the deepest convictions of our poet. To live one's life in a large and eager way, with joy for its joys and pain for its pains, without stagnation or embitterment, with mind and soul unsated and insatiable, "still achieving, still pursuing" to the end—this seemed to him worth while for its own sake. This is the sense of one of his favorite mottoes: "Ueber Graeber vorwaerts." He did not deem it necessary to ground the goodness of life upon issues that are beyond the grave—to live being the all-sufficient end and aim of living.[2]

Now there was much in this optimistic view of life that appealed to Longfellow. His youth fell in that period when there was a breaking away from the strict, stern orthodoxy of New England *Congregationalism.*[3] He was brought up in a pious regard for religion and to cherish faith in God. But he recoiled from the hard Calvinistic creed of the prevailing church. He interpreted religious beliefs broadly and was by nature peaceful and charitable toward those of other faith. He hated dogmatism. He sided with the party

[1] Wickham's *The Works of Horace*, I, 59.

[2] *Introduction to Second Part of Faust*, p. lxxii.

[3] "In the congregation of the First Parish of Portland, the moderate calvinism of the old preachers . . . . had gradually passed into the early form of Unitarianism," *Journal and Correspondence*, I, 13.

of defection from the orthodox church. It is easy to understand, consequently, his sympathy with the German poets and especially with Goethe's system of belief. Its liberality was more in accord with his views and seemed more progressive than the straiter American orthodoxy. His religious ideas were colored by Goethe's thought. His expression, for instance, of the intimate relation of God and Nature,

> And the Poet, faithful and far-seeing,
> Sees alike in stars and flowers, a part
> Of the self-same, universal being,
> Which is throbbing in his brain and heart,

sounds very much like Goethe's attractive pantheistic conception of the "All-embracing, all-preserving One." His belief in the divine nature in every human heart, which God will strengthen even in the darkened soul, is beautifully put in the Introduction to *Hiawatha:*

> Ye whose hearts are fresh and simple,
> Who have faith in God and Nature,
> Who believe, that in all ages
> Every human heart is human,
> That in even savage bosoms
> There are longings, yearnings, strivings
> For the good they comprehend not,
> That the feeble hands and helpless,
> Groping blindly in the darkness,
> Touch God's right hand in that darkness,
> And are lifted up and strengthened.[1]

He had a deeper sense, however, than Goethe of the personal relation of God, so that he emphasized his wise, benignant character, as of an omniscient, loving Father.[2]

The quotation from *Hiawatha* indicates that he did not sympathize with the idea of total depravity. He viewed sin rather leniently. Never having experienced its destructive influence in his own moral life, not knowing the sway of degrading passions, he had no deep conviction of its heinousness in God's sight. He pictures sin as the baleful work of outward forces, beleaguering the

[1] I have found many suggestions, in my summary of Longfellow's ethical views in President A. H. Strong's *American Poets and Their Theology*, chapter on Longfellow.

[2] Cf. the poems: "The Reaper and the Flowers," "The Two Angels," etc.

soul, which triumphs through faith. But these forces are phantoms, the products of our fear, more than actualities:

Down the broad Vale of Tears afar
The spectral camp is fled;
Faith shineth as a morning star,
Our ghastly fears are dead.[1]

In *The Golden Legend* he has copied Goethe's dramatic impersonation of evil, when he shows Lucifer tempting Prince Henry. The spirit of evil appears in several changing forms in the poem, but more as a crafty deceiver than as a malicious seducer. Prince Henry's selfishness is not depicted in its baseness, but only as a temporary insanity and weakness. At the last his eyes are opened to see his conduct in its right light, in time to counteract it, and then he is easily pardoned and rewarded by complete and miraculous restoration for the endurance of the trial of his faith. We must guard ourselves against laying too much stress on the ethical ideas of this poem as signalizing his own views, remembering that he was reproducing the mediaeval thought. Likewise in "Pandora" he gives us the classical mythological conceptions of sin and retribution, which may not have fairly represented his own convictions. But it is taken as evident, that his liberality of thought led him away from the strict interpretation of the Christian doctrines, as they were generally held in his time, and that he was influenced by Goethe in this respect.[2]

But in his poetry he went much further than Goethe along Christian lines. Otherwise his poetry would not have had the power in American life that it has exercised. Lacking the strong conviction of Tennyson's faith and the passionate appeal of Whittier, his poems are however shot through with expressions of Christian thought, which have given them the greatest popularity of any American poetry yet written. He was not an agnostic, disregarding the claims of the future life, but he was a sincere, humble believer, trusting the wisdom and love of God, when he could not understand his ways. Such poems as "The Reaper and the Flowers," "The Two Angels," and others, express his faith in Providence. And his sublime belief in immortality comes out in beautiful expression more

[1] "The Beleaguered City."

[2] "Indeed we mark a growing tendency toward a pagan view of the world and of religious things, as the years go on. German influences were strong, and to some extent Goethe was the poet's model," *American Poets and Their Theology*, pp. 239–40.

than once in such poems as "Resignation," "God's-Acre," "Auf Wiedersehen." One might indeed search in vain through all literature, outside of the Bible, for a more comforting picture of death than is given in his "Resignation," written after the death of his little daughter:

There is no Death! What seems so is transition;
This life of mortal breath
Is but a suburb of the life elysian,
Whose portal we call Death.

The two poets resembled one another in the philosophic calmness in regarding the vicissitudes of life. With Goethe this serenity came after a rather stormy youthful period of stress, and was the effect of his classicism. It was the evidence of the harmony between the soul and body, which he thought was found in its perfection in the classic age. But Longfellow's peaceful frame of mind was more temperamental and was also in part the act of his will, the triumph of will over feelings. Thus he sings in an early poem,[1] one which had great power over the minds of his readers, of

The star of the unconquered will,

and in another poem:[2]

Be still, sad heart! and cease repining;
Behind the clouds is the sun still shining.

But his resignation rose to a higher level than Goethe's, where it rested on faith in the good effects of sorrow. He recognized that sorrow may be accepted as a wise dispensation, and expresses this belief in "The Goblet of Life." What a passion of anguish was suppressed beneath his placid face can only be imagined from that picture of the cross upon his heart, that was found among his papers after his death. A more touching picture of the sublime endurance of grief has probably never been written:

In the long sleepless watches of the night,
A gentle face—the face of one long dead—
Looks at me from the wall, where round its head
The night-lamp casts a halo of pale light.
Here in this room she died; and soul more white
Never through martyrdom of fire was led

[1] "The Light of Stars."
[2] "The Rainy Day."

To its repose; nor can in books be read
The legend of a life more benedight.
There is a mountain in the distant West
That, sun-defying, in its deep ravines
Displays a cross of snow upon its side.
Such is the cross I wear upon my breast
These eighteen years, through all the changing scenes
And seasons, changeless since the day she died.

From this comparison of the two poets, it seems clear that Longfellow's views of art and of moral and religious life were colored by his absorption of German, particularly Goethe's, thought. Hence we can easily understand his friendly attitude toward his colleague. He could overlook or at least regard indulgently those ideas which were judged so harshly by others. His liberality of mind was confirmed and strengthened by intercourse with German literature. Consequently he welcomed the advent of this literature into America as means of broadening the horizon of his comrades. He interpreted the message in his own way in words that thrilled his countrymen and others far beyond the borders of his country. They understood him, though they may never have heard the name of Goethe. Throughout his period of service as professor at Harvard he labored quietly in the lecture hall, to impart the ideals of German culture to his hearers. Through his poetry he reached a vastly larger circle with his message of cheerful, beneficent activity. What was accomplished can be best judged in the enlargement of American thought and ideals that took place during his generation. When he began his career, art and literature in this country was in its infancy. It was still provincial in character, for the most part crude in its utterance. But through his efforts and those of his colleagues, new light streamed in, illumining the paths of life. Institutions and movements were revived by the quickening breath from abroad. The spirit of the land, without being less American, became freer, brighter, and purer. In this transformation Longfellow's service was invaluable. To him more than to any other single influence is due the credit of popularizing on this side of the ocean some of the most inspiring ideals of that upward-striving age.

W. A. CHAMBERLIN

DENISON UNIVERSITY

THE PLAGIARIZED BOOK REVIEWS OF C. F. WEISSE IN THE *BIBLIOTHEK DER SCHÖNEN WISSENSCHAFTEN*

In his autobiography Christian Felix Weisse confesses to his friend Garve that he lacks the power of sustained independent thinking, that he finds himself unable to focus his mind upon a single point, and that he cannot concentrate upon a book sufficiently long to master its contents, to say nothing of viewing it as a whole. Such a statement, even though written in a moment of dejection, will naturally arouse our suspicions regarding Weisse's ability to pass judgment upon books.[1]

While I was engaged in studies bearing upon Weisse, especially in his capacity as editor of the *Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften*, there came to my attention a matter which may throw additional light upon Weisse as an editor and a critic, as well as upon methods of reviewing books prevalent in his time.

Nicolai, the founder of the *Bibliothek* (1757), had suddenly been compelled by the death of his elder brother to give up the editorship of his periodical, and to take charge of the well-known publishing-house.[2] After some negotiations, Weisse had been persuaded to continue the *Bibliothek*, the change going into effect after the fourth volume (1758). The new editor made a few changes in the scope of the magazine, the most important addition being in the nature of an article placed at the end of each number, entitled *Vermischte Nachrichten*. Under this heading we find information concerning new paintings and engravings in the various galleries of Europe, biographical notes of persons engaged in the fine arts or literature, and finally, an extensive collection of reviews of new English and French books of poetry, the drama, travel, history, landscape-gardening, etc.

[1] *Christian Felix Weissens Selbstbiographie herausgegeben von dessen Sohne* Christian Ernst Weisse *und dessen Schwiegersohne* Samuel Gottlob Frisch. Leipzig, 1806. P. 272: "Ich glaube . . . . dass ich noch in meinem Leben kein Buch mit der gehörigen Aufmerksamkeit habe lesen können. . . . . Ein Buch, das tiefes Nachdenken, Raisonnement. Urtheil erfordert, [ist] für mich ein Blanket: am Schlusse weiss ich nicht, was ich gelesen habe, es ist alles weg und ich kann keine Rechenschaft von den darin enthaltenen Sachen geben. . . . . "

[2] Herman Hettner, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur im achtzehnten Jahrhundert*. Erstes Buch. 4. Aufl. P. 175. Braunschweig, 1893.

Herder made the statement in 1767 that as far as literary news of foreign lands was concerned, the *Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften* fully supplanted and even surpassed a *Journal étranger*, and that he would always begin reading the *Bibliothek* by opening to the *Vermischte Nachrichten*.[1]

We are here chiefly concerned with the reviews of English books in this division of the magazine. They average about nine to the number and about two to the octavo page. In a few issues they are entirely wanting, while in some there are as many as twenty-four, twenty-five, twenty-seven, and even fifty-seven reviews of English books.

Each of these reviews gives a fairly clear picture of the nature of the foreign work. Although the criticism is of the traditional kind and non-committal, the reviews in their entirety make the impression of having been written by a man who was not only thoroughly familiar with the English language, but who could read a large book through and master its contents at comparatively short notice.

No one will question Weisse's thorough reading-knowledge of English. The surprising number of his translations from that tongue will bear witness as to that.[2]

But as to critical grasp and ability implied, Weisse's own confession to Garve, already mentioned, will put us on our guard. Our suspicions will become stronger when we recall the puzzle, first touched upon by Lessing in the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* No. 73[3] and not solved until the appearance of Meisnest's article in the *Euphorion* seven years ago, regarding the connection between Weisse's *Richard III* and the *Richard III* of Shakespeare. Despite striking similarities, Weisse had pleaded not guilty to the charge of plagiarism, and many people continued to believe him. The matter remained in doubt until Meisnest[4] showed that, in a way,

[1] "Die *Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften* ist in ihren Nachrichten von den Ausländern uns völlig und noch mehr als ein *Journal étranger;* daher ich bey diesen Nachrichten zu lesen anfange und alsdenn die *Bibliothek* auf gut alt *βουστροφηδόν* zurückpflüge . . . . "—Suphan, *Herders Werke*, I, 145.

[2] *Selbstbiographie*, pp. 238–42 (a list of some of his translations).

[3] *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* 73. (12 Jan. 1768.) *Lessings sämtliche Schriften* (Lachmann-Muncker). Stuttgart, 1894. X, 95.

[4] See article by F. W. Meisnest, *Die Quellen zu Christian Felix Weisses Richard III; Euphorion*, XVII (1910), 538–56, where the dependence of Weisse upon Cibber and upon other English writers is shown.

Weisse was right. He had not plagiarized Shakespeare, because he had plagiarized a stage-version of *Richard III* by Colley Cibber. As Shakespeare's name had not appeared on this edition, Weisse may not have known that he was indirectly plagiarizing Shakespeare. At any rate, plagiarism was not unknown to Weisse in 1759, when he was publishing the *Bibliothek*.

And so it is not surprising, as regards his book reviews, that we can trace the source of much of his information to current British magazines, particularly the *Monthly Review*. This may not be considered an illegitimate means of procuring knowledge, but when entire book reviews can be shown to have been simple translations, sentence for sentence, from current English magazines, we are justified in stigmatizing this act as plagiarism pure and simple.

In the first volume of the *Bibliothek* edited by Weisse (*BSW* V [1759], 1. 204–12), of the eleven reviews of English books, the first five are more or less literal translations from reviews in the *Monthly Review* (Vols. XIX and XX [1758–59]).

Let us examine them in parallel columns. The division into paragraphs has been made to facilitate comparison.

Epistles Philosophical and Moral

BSW V (1759), 1. 204, 205

"Diese poetischen Briefe beziehen sich einiger massen auf andere, die der Verfasser vor einiger Zeit unter dem Titel: *Epistles to Lorenzo*, geliefert.

Er versichert uns, dass er eifersüchtiger auf den Charakter eines Philosophen, als eines Dichters ist; aber man muss gestehen, dass er eben so grosse poetische als philosophische Verdienste hat:

Uns scheint durch die kurzen Verse, die uns zu Lehrgedichten nicht wohl gewählt zu seyn scheinen, oft die philosophische Precision zu fehlen, die wir in der Prose erwarteten.

M.R. XX (1759), 1–17

". . . . these epistles bear reference to a part of this work published some time since, and entitled *Epistles to Lorenzo*. . . . . (p. 3, note)

He [the author] assures us that he is more ambitious of the character of a philosopher, than that of a poet. (p. 12)

. . . . he discovers great poetic merit. . . . . (*ibid.*)

The fetters of rhyme and measure will not admit of that copious, clear, and precise expression, which we may command in prose. . . . ." (p. 2)

BSW V (1759)—*Continued*

Im ersten Sendschreiben untersucht er das Kennzeichen der Wahrheit.

Im sweyten zeigt er, dass vemöge des Anspruchs, den jedermann auf die allgemeine Empfindung (common sense) hat, die Erkenntnis für ein Kennzeichen der Wahrheit gehalten zu werden scheint.

Im dritten beklagt er die Thorheit der Menschen, indem sie das leichteste Kennzeichen der Wahrheit, die *allgemeine Empfindung*, verlassen.

Im vierten redet er von den Gränzen des menschlichen Verstandes.

Das fünfte handelt von der Glückseligkeit;

Das sechste vom abstracten Guten und Bösen.

Im siebenden behauptet der Verfasser, dass der Unterschied, der im künftigen Leben zwischen den Tugendhaften und Lasterhaften seyn wird, allein von unsers Schöpfers Willen abhange, ganz ohne Absicht auf unsere Verdienste.

Dieser Brief, so schön er ist, scheint nicht ohne gefährliche Grundsätze zu seyn.

Das letzte ist der Unsterblichkeit der Seele gewidmet. . . . ." [Thereupon a brief extract from the poem is given in English, followed by:]

"Dieses Werk ist mit sehr schönen Vignetten gezieret, in welchen durch emblematische Figuren allezeit auf den Inhalt des Gedichtes angespielet wird." (pp. 204, 205)

M.R. XX (1759)—*Continued*

"In his first Epistle he examines the different criterions of truth. . . . . (p. 3)

In his second Epistle, our Author argues, that by the general pretentions of mankind to *common sense*, it is admitted that knowledge is the criterion of truth. . . . . (p. 4)

. . . . in the third Epistle, he laments the infatuation of mankind, who have rejected the general and obvious criterion of *common sense*. . . . . (p. 6)

In the fourth Epistle, the Author treats of the limits of the human understanding. . . . . (p. 8)

The argument of the fifth epistle is Happiness. . . . . (p. 9)

The sixth epistle treats of abstract good and evil. . . . . (p. 11)

In the seventh epistle, our Author asserts, that whatever distinction be made between the virtuous and vicious in a future state, it must be purely owing to the good pleasure of our Creator, and not to the influence of our merit over his final determinations. . . . . (p. 12)

This argument conveys some solid truths, interspersed with some dangerous errors. . . . . (p. 12)

The subject of the last epistle, is an enquiry concerning the immortality of the soul. . . . . (p. 14)

. . . . this work is embellished with head-pieces and tail-pieces elegantly engraved, and representing emblematical figures, which bear striking allusions to the subject of the poem. . . . ." (p. 17)

Lawson, *Lectures concerning Oratory*

BSW V (1759), 1. 206

"Diese Betrachtungen sind richtig, seine Methode ist leicht und natürlich und seine Belesenheit sehr gross." (p. 206) [Outline of contents follows.]

M.R. XX (1759), 63–79

". . . . His observations . . . . are generally just; his method is easy and natural; and he has displayed no inconsiderable share of learning. . . . ." (p. 64)

Ogilvie, *The Day of Judgment*

BSW ibid., 207, 208

[Introductory sentence of customary praise.]

". . . . Er erdichtet einen Traum, in welchem ein mächtiger Seraph sein Führer und Beschützer ist, und ihn durch jede Scene von erhabnen Schrecken hindurch führet: Nach einem kleinen Anruf an die himmlische Muse und einem Lobspruch auf den grossen Young, der zuvor diesen Weg betreten hat, kündiget er seinen erschrecklich grossen Gegenstand also an:

I leave unheeded every mortal care . . . . [etc.]

. . . . Es ist merkwürdig, dass der Verfasser dieses Gedicht in seinem 17. Jahre verfertiget." (pp. 207, 208)

M.R. XX (1759), 141–50

"These . . . . he . . . . describes . . . . as . . . . represented to him in a dream, in which a mighty seraph is his conductor and support, through every scene of sublime terror. . . . . (p. 142)

. . . . After a brief invocation of the celestial muse, with an elegant compliment to Dr. Young, who had soar'd before him on the same disquisition, he thus proposes his grand tremendous subject. . . . . (p. 142)

[The passage of the poem quoted coincides with that in the *BSW*.]

. . . . But what may prove a better apology, is the Author's being only seventeen years of age. . . . ." (p. 149)

Wilkes, *A General View of the Stage*

BSW V (1759), 1. 208

"Diess Werk ist in 4 Theile abgetheilet. Der erste handelt von der Schaubühne und den Schauspielen überhaupt; der zweyte von der Schauspielkunst oder der Kunst zu agiren. Der dritte enthält eine kurze historische Erzählung von den alten und neuern Theatern; und

M.R. XX (1759), 315–21

". . . . His work is divided into four parts. The first treats of the stage and stage-plays, in general. The second of the art of acting. In the third is given, a short historical account of the stage, ancient and modern; and the fourth contains a critical examination of the merits

BSW V (1759)—*Continued*

der 4te eine kritische Prüfung von den grössern oder geringern Verdiensten der vornehmsten Schauspieler in England. Er ist zu verschwenderisch mit seinen Lobsprüchen, und viele von seinen Urtheilen scheinen von den Kunstrichtern der Coffeehäuser zusammengelesen zu seyn. . . . . " (p. 208) [Four additional lines to the review.]

M.R. XX (1759)—*Continued*

and demerits of the principal actors in England and Ireland. . . . . (p. 318) A repetition . . . . of florid encomiums on Shakespeare and Garrick, appear to us extremely needless and disgusting . . . . the whole . . . . might easily be gathered from the daily conversation of our coffee-house criticks. . . . . " (p. 317)

Cleone, a Tragedy, by R. Dodsley

BSW V (1759), 1. 208, 209

"Die Verwicklung dieses Trauerspiels ist zu einfach. . . . . Die Sprache ist den Charakteren noch ziemlich angemessen, aber fast ohne allen Schmuck der Poesie. . . . . " (pp. 208, 209)

M.R. XIX (1758), 582, 583

". . . . The plot is too thin, the scenes are too barren of incidents, ... and the language, in general, too much, though not altogether, destitute of poetry. . . . ." (p. 583)

Ancient and Modern Rome, a Poem

BSW VIII (1761), 1. 164–67

"Diesem schönen Gedichte ist ein Kupferstich vorgesetzt, der einige von den merkwürdigsten Denkmälern des Alterthums, ein Theil eines weiten Circus, einen Obelisk, und eine Säule, vielleicht die Columnam Trajani, und in einer entfernten Aussicht die Peterskirche vorstellet. . . . . " (p. 164)

M.R. XXII (1760), 145–49

"A handsome plate is prefixed in the title-page of this elegant Poem, representing some of the most striking remains of Antiquity in Rome, as part of a large Circus, an Obelisk, and a Pillar, perhaps Trajan's, almost entire; with a distant view of St. Peter's Church. . . . ." (p. 145)

[The passages quoted from the work itself coincide.]

"Wie schön sind nicht folgende Zeilen, die die Einkleidung einer Nonne beschreiben.

"Noch ruf ich den Tag zurücke. . . . . " (etc.) (p. 166)

Der Dichter schliesst mit den gerechten Lobsprüchen, in denen er das neuere Italien in Ansehung der Mahlerey, Musik, Bildhauerkunst und Baukunst erhebt." (p. 167)

". . . . The following lines beautifully describe the ceremony of giving the first veil on the admission of a Nun.

'Still I recall the day,' [etc.] (p. 148)

. . . . this benevolent writer concludes his poem by celebrating modern Italy, for the center and preserver of Music, Statuary, and Painting. . . . ." (p. 148)

Imitations of Juvenal and Persius by I. Nevile

NBSW X (1771), 1. 171

"Herr Neville hat schon verschiedene Nachahmungen des Horaz herausgegeben, die ihr Verdienst haben. . . . . kaum aber können sie Nachahmungen genannt werden. . . . . " (p. 171)

M.R. XLII (1770), 46–52

"Mr. Nevile has published several imitations of the satires of Horace, which have their merit; . . . . his present work may more properly be called *Hints of Satire taken from Juvenal and Persius* than *Imitations* of those great satirists. . . . ." (p. 46)

The Summer Day

NBSW XI (1770), 1. 168

"Der Verfasser dieser vier Tagezeiten, hat eine lebhafte Einbildungskraft und viel Geschicklichkeit in der poetischen Mahlerey, obgleich seine Versification nicht allezeit sehr leicht ist: Freunden der reizenden Auftritte der Natur wird es sicher gefallen." (p. 168)

M.R. XLII (1770), 486

"The Author of this descriptive poem is by no means deficient in imagination, but we can say nothing in praise of his versification." (p. 486)

Hugh Kelly, *A Word to the Wise*

NBSW XI (1771), 2. 355

"Diese Komödie wurde von dem Theater getrieben, ohne dass man sie anhörte, unter dem Vorwande, dass Herr Kelly in eine Zeitung *the Public Ledger*, von der er die Aufsicht hatte, verschiedene Versuche zur Vertheidigung der Regierung eingerückt hätte: er verlor dadurch den Vortheil der ersten Vorstellung, die doch auf 600 Pf. betragen konnte und hat sie nun auf Subscription drucken lassen. . . . . " (p. 355)

M.R. XLIII (1771), 150, 151

". . . . It is now published by subscription, because it was driven from the stage without being heard: the pretence was that Mr. Kelly, who managed a news-paper called the *Public Ledger*, had inserted in that paper, essays and paragraphs in favour of government . . . . arbitrarily depriving him of the reward of his labour, was an act . . . . injurious, tyrannical, and oppressive. . . . ." (p. 150)

Almida, a Tragedy. By a Lady[1]

NBSW XII (1771), 2. 333

"Dieses Stück ist der *Tankred* des Voltaire von der Mrs. Barry,[2] der

M.R. XLIV (1771), 150–55

"The model of this play . . . . is the *Tancrede* of Voltaire. . . . .

[1] "Said to be the daughter to the late Mr. David Mallet. Her husband is M. Celesia, a Genoese gentleman. . . . ."

[2] The authoress was Mrs. Clesia, as a footnote on p. 150 of the *M.R.* states. The German reviewer evidently took Mrs. Barry, the great English actress, to be the authoress.

BSW XII (1771)—*Continued*

Tochter des verstorbenen Mallet. Sie hat den Dialog hin und wieder absukürzen gesucht, aber dadurch es doch nicht dem englischen Publiko unterhaltend genug machen können." (p. 333)

M.R. XLIV (1771)—*Continued*

. . . . she has taken the liberty to shorten some of the speeches. . . . . the performance is still too much a French play to please an English audience. . . . ." (pp. 150, 151)

G. Bannatyne, *Ancient Scottish Poems*

NBSW XII (1771), 2. 336, 337

"Man hat schon vor einigen Jahren eine Sammlung aller schottischen Gedichte unter dem Titel: Evergrun [sic], erhalten, welche der berühmte Allan Ramsay herausgegeben: aber es waren verschiedene schon neuere darunter. Die gegenwärtigen, die der Lord Hailes herausgiebt, sind alt und sehr alt. Man weiss, wie viel dergleichen Lieder zur Känntniss der Sitten und der Menschen der verschiedenen Zeitalter und der Geschichte des Witzes beytragen können. Des Lords Anmerkungen, die er dieser Sammlung angefüget, beziehen sich auch darauf. Es wäre zu wünschen, dass das angehängte kleine Wörterbuch vollständiger wäre, damit die veraltete Sprache auch Ausländer verstehen könnten." [!] (pp. 336, 337)

M.R. XLIV (1771), 42–48

[Not given here in the same order as in the periodical.]

". . . . A larger work of this kind was published some years ago under the title of the Evergreen, by the celebrated Allan Ramsay; but in that miscellany there were many things of modern date. The poems here collected are certainly ancient, and some of them are of very high antiquity. . . . .

The preservation of ancient poetry is . . . . no less rational than the preservation of ancient coins; for . . . . the former . . . . promotes our knowledge of the manners and pursuits of men in their respective periods. . . . .

. . . . Lord Hailes, the learned Editor, has, by his notes annexed to this collection, contributed greatly to the same end. . . . . The only objection which lies against this edition is the exceeding deficiency of the glossary, which does not include one fourth part of the words necessary to be explained to people on this side of the Tweed. . . . ." (p. 42)

from the statement on p. 155 of the *M.R.* ". . . . Upon the whole we are of opinion, that nothing could have supported this piece upon the stage, but the very great theatrical abilities of Mrs. Barry. . . . ."

Paradise Regained, a Poem, in Four Books. By John Milton

NBSW LIX (1797), 1. 184

"Die Absicht des Herausg. bey seiner Arbeit war vorzüglich, das Publikum von neuem auf die Schönheiten eines, wie er glaubt, nicht genug geschätzten Gedichtes aufmerksam zu machen, von welchem *Johnson* sagt, ... Der Herausg. scheint sich Miltons besten Erklärer, *Thomas Warton*, zum Muster genommen zu haben. Er besitzt kritischen Scharfsinn, ausgebreitete Gelehrsamkeit und Feinheit des Geschmacks; seine Anmerkungen sind zweckmässig und allen denen zu empfehlen, welche ihr Gefühl für das Erhabne und Grosse auszubilden bemüht sind." (p. 184)

M.R. Enlarged XX (1796), 74–77

". . . . Mr. Dunster, who seems ambitious of treading in the steps of the learned critic and ingenious poet just mentioned, [Thomas Warton] has now favoured the public with an edition of *Paradise Regained;* a poem which, he thinks, has not hitherto been praised as it deserves. . . . ." (p. 75)

". . . . Mr. Dunster: who, to a due portion of critical accuracy, joins extensive learning, elegance of taste, a liberal cast of mind. . . . ." (p. 75)

[There follows a long *note* from the book.]

"We shall here conclude this article,—sincerely recommending the present edition . . . . to the perusal of those who have a taste for sublime poetry and ingenious criticism. . . . ." (p. 77)

The foregoing examples will illustrate how Weisse went to work. He would read whatever the *Monthly Review* had to say, pick out words, phrases, and whole sentences, add a little material of his own, and finally wind up with a quotation.

The examples have been chosen at random, but a careful comparison of Vols. V and XII of the *Bibliothek* and Vols. I, X, XX, and XXX of the *Neue Bibliothek* with the *Monthly Review* shows that this periodical, at least, continued to be one of the sources of Weisse's information about English literature.

That *The Scot's Magazine* was also used, the following examples will show:

NBSW Volume	Number of Reviews in Issue	Number of Reviews Dependent upon *MR*
X, 1	12	3
X, 2	9	2
XX, 1	10	3
XX, 2	8	1
XXX, 2	6	2

Jerningham's *Faldoni and Theresa*

NBSW XV (1774) 2. 355

"Ein junges verliebtes Paar zu Lyon, wird an seiner Vereinigung durch die Härte der Verwandten von Seiten des jungen Mädchens gehindert. Ohne weitere Hoffnung fassen sie den Entschluss einander zu gleicher Zeit zu töten, errichten heimlich eine Art des Altars, knien davor und vollziehen ihren Entschluss.—
Die enthusiastische Leidenschaft dieser Liebhaber ist ungemein gut geschildert und ein empfindliches Herz wird es nicht ohne Thränen lesen können." (p. 355)

The Scot's Magazine, XXXV (1773)

". . . . A young man and a young woman at Lyons, two years ago, who had conceived a passion for each other, were prevented from marrying by the girl's relatives. Finding it impossible to remove this obstacle to their union, they desperately resolved to destroy themselves; and for this purpose they erected a kind of altar in a private retreat, and kneeling before it, each held a pistol, to the triggers of which were tied rose-coloured ribands. Each held the riband which was fastened to the other's pistol; on pulling which, at a signal agreed on, they put an end to each other's life. The enthusiastic passion of these lovers our author has expressed very happily, and the reader who has the least sensibility will scarcely fail of shedding a tear at the melancholy tale." [Signed] C. (pp. 89, 90)

Conscience: An Ethical Essay. By Rev. J. Brand

NBSW XV (1774), 2. 358

"Der Dichter der seinen Gegenstand philosophisch geprüft, hat ihn durch den sehr poetischen Schmuck interessant gemacht; doch fällt er auch bisweilen ins Schwülstige." (p. 358)

The Scot's Magazine, XXXV (1773), 40, 41

". . . . The Author has treated his subject in a philosophical manner, but rendered it at the same time extremely interesting to the passions, by an animated strain of poetry. The description is in general highly beautiful and luxuriant." [Signed] C. (p. 41)

"In reading this poem we have been pleased by some bold and poetical passages, and offended by others that were turgid and prosaic." [Signed] M. (p. 41)

Conscience: A Poetical Essay. By W. Gibson. 1772

NBSW XV (1774), 2. 358

"Der Dichter schildert den Fortgang der Sünde im Gegensatze mit dem Gewissen von dem Falle Adam an, bis auf jetzige Zeiten." (p. 358)

The Scot's Magazine, XXXV (1773)

". . . . The author considers the progress of sin, in opposition to conscience, from the fall of Adam to the present times." [Signed] M. (p. 40)

An Agreeable Companion for a Few Hours

NBSW XV (1774), 2. 358

"Die flüchtigen Stücke, die diese Sammlung enthält, und die sich durch eine ungemeine Simplicität und Zärtlichkeit unterscheiden, werden geschmackvollen Lesern nicht gleichgültig seyn: sie stellen hauptsächlich Scenen aus dem ländlichen Leben vor." (p. 358)

The Scot's Magazine, XXXV (1773)

"These fugitive pieces may be ranked among the few poetical productions of recent date, the perusal of which can afford pleasure to a reader of genuine taste." [Signed] C. (p. 41)

The Sentimental Sailor. Or St. Preux to Eloisa. An Elegy. In Two Parts. With Notes.

With *NBSW* XV (1774), 2. 364, 365 compare *The Scot's Magazine*, XXXV (1773), 151, 152. The first and last sentences of the German review are almost literal translations.

The examples given here will suffice to prove that the *Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften* made a regular practice of slavishly copying from the *Monthly Review* and *The Scot's Magazine*, at least, without a single acknowledgment. In many cases there is no proof that the reviewer had ever seen the book he was reviewing. It is true that for a very large number of the reviews I could find no parallels, and I am not ready to say that Weisse borrowed from English magazines in all cases. On the other hand, he may have had access to other English reviews which I have been unable to discover.

In order to determine whether Weisse's practice was perhaps a general one in an age that had not yet developed our modern sense of intellectual authorship, I examined other periodicals of a similar nature and found no other instances of like nature. All the reviews in Eschenburg's *Brittisches Museum für die Deutschen* to be sure were translated from the English reviews, but Eschenburg states his intention in the preface.

That nevertheless there were probably other reviewers engaging in the same practice is suggested by the following quotation from the *Neues Hannöverisches Magazin* for 1800, No. 14, Cols. 216–17, in an article entitled *Ueber die Diebstähle der Gelehrten:*

"Die Blätter des Tages, die Journale, Wochenschriften, Zeitschriften, Zeitungen, Magazine, u.s.w. haben sich schon seit ihrer ersten Entstehung das Recht angemasst, fremde Produkte ohne Scheu aufzunehmen. Sie gleichen den Corsaren in Algier, die das Beutemachen handwerksmässig treiben. In so ferne manche nützliche Wahrheiten dadurch gemeinnützlicher werden, haben sie eine bedeutende Entschuldigung für sich. . . . . Die kleinen Betrügereien der Schriftsteller und Buchhändler . . . . Uebersetzungen für eigene Arbeit auszugeben, ... werden von den kritischen Blättern, wie wohl mehrenteils fruchtlos, nach Verdienst gerügt."

Evidently Weisse's practice, while not unusual, was nevertheless considered, then as now, genuine plagiarism.

CHARLES PAUL GIESSING

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

EIN TRISTANFRAGMENT

Das *Ms. Germ. fol.* 923 (Sammelmappe) der Königl. Bibliothek, Berlin, nach einer sorgfältigen Abschrift A. Reifferscheids vom Jahre 1878 hier zum ersten Mal mitgeteilt, enthält auf einem Pergamentdoppelblatt in Quart aus etwa der Mitte des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts, zweispaltig beschrieben, die Spalte zu 41 Zeilen, die Verse 10614–10776 und 11433–11596 von Gottfrieds *Tristan*. Für eine genauere Beschreibung verweise ich auf Scheel, *Die Berliner Sammelmappe deutscher Fragmente. Festschrift für Weinhold*, Leipzig, 1896, S. 35, Nr. 4, sowie auf Marold, S. liii seiner Ausgabe, wo das Fragment mit *m* bezeichnet wird. Obgleich das Bruchstück schon lange bekannt und für die Kritik verwertet worden ist, lohnt es sich wohl der Vollständigkeit halber dasselbe den Fachgenossen allgemein zugänglich zu machen.

Der Dialekt ist alemannisch und der Text stellt sich nahe zu dem der Fragmente *f* und *t*, worüber ist jetzt zu vergleichen Ranke, *Zeitschr. f. d. A.*, LV, 157 ff. Im folgenden halte ich mich eng an der Überlieferung, nur werden Abkürzungen durch Kursivdruck aufgelöst. Für *daz* steht in der Handschrift gewöhnlich *dc.* Neue Abschnitte werden durch Ausrücken der Zeile bezeichnet; einmal, bei Vers 10695, steht eine grosse rote Initiale (H), welche den Raum von fünf Zeilen einnimmt. Mit *a* und *b* werden Vorder- und Rückseite des Blattes bezeichnet.

BLATT 1*a*, SPALTE 1

Marold 10614 die man ze beiden namen sol haben.
daz ez allez ein was.
wan swederhalben ich hin las.
so ne was ie ni me dar an.
wan tantris oder tristan.
vnd ie an einem beide.
Nv mv̊ter nv sceide.
disen namen tantris.
in einen tan vnd in einen tris.
vnd sprechet daz tris fur daz tan.
so sprichestv tristan.

sprich daz tan vur daz tris.
so sprichestv tantris.
Div mv̊ter segenete sich.
got sprach si der gesegene mich.
von wannen kom dir ie der sin.
nu si dri von im vnder in.
geredeten menger hande.
div kunegin div sande.
Nach dem kunege.
der kom dar.
sehet herre sprechent si nemet war.
ir sulent vns einer bete gewern.
daz wir dri ernesliche gern.
tv̊t irz ez kumet vns allen wol.
ich volge swez ich volgen sol.
Swaz ir wellet dast getan.
habet ir danne an mich verlan.
sprach abr div kunegin.
ia. swaz ir wellet daz sol sin.
Gnade herre daz ist genv̊c.
herre der minen brv̊der slv̊c.
tristan den han ich hinne.
dem sult ir iuwer minne.
vnd iuwer hulde lazen han.
sin gewerp der ist also getan.
daz div sv̊ne vv̊ge hat.
Der kunec sprach triwen disen rat.
den laz ich baltliche an dich.
er gat dich mere an danne mich.
morolt din brv̊der waz dir.

BLATT 1*a*, SPALTE 2

naher gesippe danne mir.
hastuz vmbe in varn verlan.
wiltu so han ich ez getan.
Sus seite si dem kunege do.
tristandes mere rehte also.
als er ir selbe sagete.
diz mere daz behagete.
dem kunege wol vnd sprach ir zv̊.
nv sich daz ers mit triwen tv̊.
Div kunegin do sande.
brangenen nach tristande.

vnd als tristan in gie.
dem kunege er sich ze fvzen lie.
gnade herre kunec sprach er.
stat vf herre tristan gat her.
sprach gurnun vnd kusset mich.
vngerne verkiuse ich.
idoch verkiuse ich den zorn.
sit in die vrowen hant verkorn.
Herre sprach abr tristan.
an dirre svne da ist an.
min herre vnd beide siniv lant.
ia sprach her gurnun zehant.
nv disiu svne zende kam.
div kunegin tristanden nam.
vnd sazten zv der tohter nider.
vnd bat in ovch daz mere wider.
ir herren al von erest sagen.
wie ez sich hete dar getragen.
an allen disen sachen.
beide vmbe den trachen.
vnd vmbe dez kuneges markes ger.
daz seiter abr von ende her.
Der kunec sprach abr herre tristan.
nv wie bewar ich mich her an.
daz ich der rede gewis si.
vil wol herre ich han hie bi.
mines herren fursten alle.
swaz gewisheit iv gevalle.
die saget ir mir div ist getan.
die wile vnd ich ir einen han.

*BLATT 1*b*, SPALTE 1*

Hie mite sciet der kunec dan.
die vrowen vnde tristan.
die beliben abr eine da.
tristan nam paranisen sa.
geselle sprach er get hin abe.
da stet ein kiel in der habe.
da ga geswazliche hin.
vnd vrage welcher vnder in.
Curuenal si genant.
dem selben rvne zehant
daz er ze sime herren ge.
vnd sage ovch nieman niht me.

vnd bringe in lise als hovesch du sis.
nv herre daz tet paranys.
er brahte in also lise dar.
daz sin nieman wart gewar.
Nv si in zer kemenaten.
fur die vrowen traten.
im neic div kuneginne.
vnd nieman me dar inne.
sine namen sin durch daz niht war.
erne kam niht als ein riter dar.
Nv curvenal tristanden.
den vrowen vnder handen.
vroliche vnd gesvnden sach.
in franzoyser wis er sprach.
Ay bea duz syre.
durch gotes willen waz tvt ire.
daz ir sus wunnecliche.
in disem himelriche.
sus lusent verborgen.
vnd lat vns in den sorgen.
wir wanden alle sin verlorn.
biz iezo hetich wol gesworn.
daz ir lebende iht weret.
wie habet ir vns besweret.
Iwer kiel vnd iuwer livte.
die gesworen wol noch hivte.
vnd habent ez da vur ir sit tot.
vnd sint mit micheler not.
her vnze an dise naht beliben.

BLATT 1*b*, SPALTE 2

vnd heten daz in ein getriben.
si woltent hinaht hinnen sin.
Nein sprach div gvte kunegin.
er lebet gesunder vnde vro.
vnd tristan der begunde do.
britvnsce sprechen wider in.
curuenal sprach er ga balde hin.
vnd sage hin nider min dinc sta wol.
vnd ich ez allez enden sol.
da nach wir vs sin gesant.
hie mite so seiter im zehant.
sine linge al von grunde.

so er ebeneste kunde.
Nv er im hete geseit.
sin gelucke vnd sin arbeit.
nv sprach er balde ga hin nider.
sage minen lantherren wider.
vnd ouch den ritteren dar zů.
daz ir iegesliche vrv̊.
mit sinem dinge sin bereit.
wol gestrichen vnd gecleit.
mit der aller besten wat.
die ir iegeslicher hat.
vnd nemen mines boten war.
swenne ich in den sende dar.
so riten her ze houe ze mir.
Ouch send ich morgen frů ze dir.
so sende mir den cleinen scrin.
da miniv cleinote inne sin.
vnd miniv cleder da mite.
die von dem aller besten snite.
dich selbe clede ouch als wol.
als ein houesc riter sol.
Curvenal neic vnd kerte dan.
brangene sprach wer ist der man.
in dunket werliche.
hier inne si ein himelriche.
weder ist er riter oder kneht.
frowe swa vur ir geseht.
er ist ein riter vnde man.
dane habet dekeinen zwiuel an.

Blatt 2*a*, Spalte 1

11433 die wil vnd sich ouch tristan.
mit sinen lantgesellen dan.
bereite vnd berihte.
die wile so betihte.
ysot div wise kunegin.
in ein glazevezzelin.
einen tranc von minnen.
mit also cleinen sinnen.
vf geleit vnd vorbedaht.
in solchem liste vurbraht.
mit swem sin ieman getranc.
den můzer ane sinen danc.

vor allen dingen meinen.
vnd er da wider in einen.
in was ein tot vnd ein leben.
ein truren ein vrode samet gegeben.
Den tranc den nam div wize.
si sprach brangenen lize.
brangene sprach si niftel min.
la dir die rede niht swere sin.
dv solt mit miner tohter hin.
da nach so stelle dinen sin.
daz ich dir sage daz vernim.
diz glaz mit dizem tranke nim.
daz habe in diner hv̊te.
hv̊tes vor allem gv̊te.
sich daz ez vf der erde.
iemen innen werde.
Bewar mit allem vlize.
daz ez ieman enbizze.
vlize dich wol starke.
swenne ysot vnde marke.
inein der minnen comen sin.
so scenke in disen tranc vur win.
vnd laz in trinken vz in ein.
bewar daz daz sin mit in zwein.
iemen enbize daz ist sin.
noch selbe trinkes niht mit in.
der tranc der ist von minnen.
daz habe in dinen sinnen.
Ich beuilhe dir ysote.

BLATT 2*a*, SPALTE 2

vil tvre vnd vil genote.
an ir so lit min leben.
ich vnde si sin dir ergeben.
vf alle dine seleckeit.
hie mite si dir genv̊c geseit.
Trvt vrowe sprach brangene do.
ist iwer beider wille also.
so sol ich gerne mit ir varn.
ir ere vnd al ir dinc bewarn.
so ich iemer beste kan.
vrlop nam do tristan.
vnd al sin liut hie vnde dort.
si sciedent ze weisefort.

mit michelen vrouden abe.
nv volget im vz in die habe.
durch ysote minne.
kunec vnde kuneginne.
vnd al ir massenie.
sin vnverwande amie.
sin vnerkantiv herze not.
div liehte wunnecliche ysot.
div waz im ze allen ziten.
weinende an der siten.
ir vater ir mv̊ter beide.
vertriben mit mengem leide.
die selben kurzen stunde.
menic ouge da begunde.
riezen vnde werden rot.
ysot waz menges herzen not.
si bar vil menigem herzen.
togenlichen smerzen.
div weneten genote.
ir ougen wvnne ysote.
Da waz gemeineiv weine.
da weineten gemeine.
vil herzen vnd vil ovgen.
offenliche vnd togen.
vnd abr ysot vnd abr ysot.
div svnne vnd ir morgenrot.
vnd ouch daz vol meine.
div scone brangeine.

BLATT 2*b*, SPALTE 1

do si sich mv̊zen sceiden.
div eine von den beiden.
do sach man iamer vnde leit.
div getrvliche sicherheit.
sciet sich mit mengem leide.
ysot custe si beide.
dicke vnd ze mengem male.
Nv die von kurnewale.
vnde ouch von yrlandere.
der vrowen volgere.
alle ze sciffe waren komen.
vnd heten vrlop genomen.
tristan der gie ze iungest in.

div liehte ivnge kunegin.
div blome von yrlant.
ysot div gienc im an der hant.
trurec vnde sere vnvro.
si zwei si nigen dem lande do.
vnd baten den gotes segen.
der liute vnd dez landes pflegen.
si stiezen an vnd fûren dan.
mit hoher stimme hûbens an.
vnd sunges eines vnde zwir.
in gotes namen varen wir.
vnd strichen alles hinewart.
Nv waz den vrowen zv̊zir vart.
mit tristandes rate.
ein kiel kemenate.
nach heimlicher sache.
gar gegeben zv̊zir gemache.
da waz div kuneginne.
mit ir ivncvrowen inne.
vnd vil luzel kein man.
wan vnderwilen tristan.
der gie wilent dar in.
vnd troste die kunegin.
da si weinende saz.
div weininde clagete daz.
daz si als von ir lande.
da si die liute erkande.
vnd von ir vriunden allen sciet.

BLATT 2*b*, SPALTE 2

vnd vv̊r mit der vnkunden diet.
sine wiste war oder wie.
so troste si tristan ie.
so er sûzeste kunde.
ze iegelicher stunde.
als er zûzir truren quam.
zewiscen sin arme er si nam.
vil sûze vnde lise.
vnd niwan in der wise.
als ein man sine vrowen sol.
der getriwe der versach sich wol.
daz er der sconen were.
ein senfte zûzir swere.
vnd als ez ergie.

d*az* er sin arme an si verlie.
so gedahte ie diu scone ysot.
an ir ovheimes tot.
vn*d* sp*r*ach ie danne wider in.
lat stan meister habet iv hin.
tv̊t iwer arme hin dan.
ir sit ein harte mv̊lich man.
war vmbe rv̊ret ir mich.
ey scone missetv̊n ich.
ia ir wan ich bin iv gehaz.
seligiv sp*r*ach er vmbe waz.
ir slv̊get minen ovhein.
d*az* ist doch versv̊net. des allein.
ir sit mir doch vmmere.
wan ich were ane swere.
vn*d* ane sorge enweret ir.
ir alterseine habt mir.
disen kumber allen vf geleit.
mit parate vn*d* mit kundekeit.
waz iuch mir ze scaden gesant.
von curnewale in yrlant.
die mich von kinde habent erzogen.
den habent ir mich nv an ertrogen.
vn*d* fv̊ret mich ine weiz wa hin.
ine weiz wie ich v*er*koufet bin.
vn*d* weiz ovch waz min werden sol.
Nein scone ysot gehabet iuch wol.

JOHN L. CAMPION

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Vom sprachvergleichenden Standpunkte kann man also seit den siebziger Jahren die Ursprünglichkeit von *bh, dh, gh* als anerkannt betrachten; dunkel war noch ihre lautphysiologische Definierung. Auch hier wurde Licht geschafft. Wie es schon Bruecke in den oben erwähnten Ausführungen theoretisch getan hatte, unterscheidet Sievers (*Grundzüge der Phonetik*—mir ist nur die 5. Auflage zugänglich—S. 170 ff.) in heutigen indischen Dialekten zwei (bzw. drei) wirklich vorkommende Arten dieser Laute, nämlich solche mit stimmhaftem und mit stimmlosem (und mit verstärktem) Hauch. Seine Angaben (wie auch die von Ellis u.a.) stützen sich auf persönliche Beobachtungen, und es ändert nichts an der Sache, dass Hoffory gehässig gegen ihn polemisiert.[1]

Die Frage, ob dem Indogermanischen für seine stimmhaften Aspiraten stimmhafter oder stimmloser Hauch zuzuschreiben sei, ist nicht entschieden worden.

5. MERINGER, WALDE.—Klarstellungen der indischen Aussprachеverhältnisse der heutigen Zeit sind nun freilich für die Ursprache nicht direkt beweiskräftig. Für diese machte vielmehr Meringer (*ZföG*, 1888, S. 122, in einer Besprechung von Brugmanns *Grundriss*) einen neuen Versuch einer Lösung. Nach ihm "sind die Lautphysiologen heute noch nicht darüber einig, ob eine Vereinigung der media mit nachfolgendem tonlosem Hauch, d.h. eine media aspirata nach gewöhnlicher Auffassung überhaupt möglich sei" (S. 142); auf grund der arischen Entwicklung von *bh-t, gh-t, dh-t* zu *bdh, gdh, ddh* kommt er zu dem Schluss, dass *t* in diesen Verbindungen tönende Nachbarschaft hatte, "und da liegt die Annahme zunächst, dass *h* in *gγt, bβt, dzt* der homorgane Spirant war." Um die kombinatorischen Lautvorgänge dieser Gruppen zu erklären, nimmt er

[1] Besonders in dem Briefe an Meringer, *ZföG*, 1888, S. 774; Sievers' Beschreibung der media aspirata sei "so erbärmlich und leichtfertig, dass es nicht nötig ist, weiter darauf einzugehen; die Definition, die er aufstellt, ist so widerspruchsvoll, dass sie sich selbst widerlegt (die med. asp. sind nämlich nach ihm tönende Verschlusslaute mit nachfolgendem 'tönendem Hauch'; als ob ein Hauch nicht *eo ipso* tonlos wäre!)."—Dass mehrere Sprachen, darunter neben dem Ungarischen und dem Böhmischen auch das Indische, tatsächlich stimmhaftes *h*, also "tönenden Hauch" haben, ist ja bekannt.

also an, dass die fraglichen Laute eigentlich Affrikaten gewesen seien: *gγ, bβ, dz.*

Gegen ihn macht Walde (*KZ*, XXXIV, 461) mit Recht geltend, dass seine Annahme die Schwierigkeiten der betreffenden Lautverbindungen keineswegs löst; er vermutet vielmehr (wie es schon Bruecke getan hatte) stimmhafte Spiranten für das Indogermanische, doch beschränkt er sich bei seiner Begründung auf das Hauchdissimilationgesetz:

Griechisch und Altindisch zeigen, dass das Vorhandensein von Aspiraten im Anlaut zweier aufeinanderfolgender Silben als sehr schwer sprechbar empfunden wurde, weshalb der erste Hauch unterdrückt wurde. Ist es da wahrscheinlich, dass das Indogermanische, wenn es mediae aspiratae besass, wirklich von dissimilatorischen Vorgängen verschont geblieben sein sollte? Gewiss nicht. Da aber Dissimilationsspuren vollkommen fehlen, so muss es auch von diesem Standpunkte als höchst wahrscheinlich bezeichnet werden, dass die sogenannten aspirierten Verschlusslaute des Indogermanischen etwas anderes waren als Verschlusslaute mit gehauchtem Absatz. Andrerseits sahen wir oben, dass ein tönendes spirantisches Element mindestens den letzten Teil unserer fraglichen Laute gebildet habe. Daher bleibt als einziges Auskunftsmittel die Annahme übrig, dass die mediae aspiratae nach ihrem Lautwerte einfach tönende Spiranten waren: *ð, z̄, z, z̬, ƀ.*

Es ist schade, dass Walde, in dessen Anschauungen sicher ein richtiger Kern steckt, bei dieser unzureichenden Begründung stehen geblieben ist. Es war natürlich, dass er keine Folge fand. Foy (*KZ*, XXXV, 15) wendet gegen ihn ein: "Der Wahrscheinlichkeitsgrund, aus der gleichen Hauchdissimilation im ai. und gr. lasse sich schliessen, dass im idg. keine mediae asp. bestanden, ... ist bei unserer jetzigen Kenntnis der Sprachentwicklung von vornherein hinfällig: was in der einen Periode als leicht sprechbar erschien, konnte in einer andern Schwierigkeiten bereiten." Auch Brugmann verhält sich ablehnend (*Grdr.*², I, 292), und Walde hat seither seine Anschauung selbst stillschweigend widerrufen (*IF*, XIX, 98).

Den ganzen Stand der Beweisführung für die "Indogermanenschaft" von *bh, dh, gh* fasst 1907 (*KZ*, XLI, 31) Hermann in folgender Weise zusammen:

Will man einen Einheitslaut rekonstruieren, so kommt man auf eine media aspirata. Gestützt wird der Ansatz 1. dadurch, dass das Indische den Laut wirklich besitzt; 2. dadurch, dass er für das Italische mit Hilfe der andern Sprachen leicht erschlossen werden kann; 3. durch die ganz

eigentümliche Entwicklung, die dieser Laut in den andern Sprachen genommen hat. Auch wenn man das Indische nicht besässe, würde eine Einheitsrekonstruktion auf ihn führen [??]. Es gibt keinen andern Laut, der in unserm Falle als gemeinsame Quelle näher läge denn die media aspirata. Besonders eine Betrachtung des Italischen und des Keltischen gewinnt für den Ansatz. Dass das Uritalische media aspirata gekannt hat, würde man, wenn man Walde (*IF*, XIX, 98 f.)[1] folgen will, auch ohne das Indische vermuten können; in Waldes Beispielen spielen ja indische Etymologien keine Rolle. Ferner sind im Keltischen indisch *b*, *bh* zusammengefallen, ebenso *d*, *dh* und *j*, *h*, wie im Iranischen, Albanesischen, Balto-Slavischen; *g* und *gh* aber nicht. Wird da nicht das Keltische einmal auch jene andern Laute unterschieden haben? Wird ferner nicht auch im Iranischen, Albanesischen, Balto-Slavischen einmal ein Unterschied gewesen sein? Obgleich keine Einzelsprache ausser dem Indischen auf media aspirata führt, hat der Ansatz doch viel Verlockendes.

6. Zusammenfassung.—Trotz alledem wird man zugeben müssen, dass die bisherige Begründung ursprachlicher stimmhafter Aspiraten recht unsicher ist. Die Geschichte der Theorie, um sie kurz zu wiederholen, ergibt das Folgende:

Curtius und Grassmann wiesen nach, dass die fraglichen Laute nicht Abspaltungen aus idg. Medien oder stimmlosen Aspiraten gewesen sein können. Das ist ein unzweifelhaftes Verdienst. Ascolis Arbeiten über den Gegenstand sind methodisch gewiss sehr schön, tragen auch dazu bei, dass sie *mit Zugrundelegung der vorgefassten Meinung*, dass indisch *bh*, *dh*, *gh* die Ausgangslaute sein müssten, den italischen Zustand dem System einpassen, aber eine wirkliche Förderung der Erkenntnis der Laute selbst bedeuten sie nicht. Die physiologische Seite der anzusetzenden Lautübergänge ist trotz Hermanns eben erwähnten Ausführungen (auch trotz Bloomfield, *AJPh*, XXXII, 56) noch keineswegs klar, wie es denn überhaupt mit der Anwendung phonetischer Erkenntnis auf die historische Sprachwissenschaft noch immer recht schlecht bestellt ist. Was dem einen natürlich scheint, kommt dem andern abenteuerlich vor; es wird geklügelt, und wer einigermassen scharfsinnig ist, dem muss es ja gelingen, so ziemlich jeden Lautwandel, ob er nun in Wirklichkeit vorkommt oder nicht, unter eine lautphysiologische Formel zu bringen—wenn er ihn isoliert, statt ihn im Zusammenhang des

[1] Walde dehnt das Hauchdissimilationsgesetz auf das Italische aus; vgl. § 17 und Sommer, *KE*, S. 50.

ganzen Lautcharakters einer bestimmten Sprache zu betrachten.[1] Es ist beispielsweise ebenso leicht, den Übergang von *b* zu *v* wie den von *v* zu *b*, den von *t* zu *þ* wie den von *þ* zu *t* zu erklären—alle vier kommen ja oft genug vor. So lässt sich sicher "phonetisch" das griechische *ph* ohne Schwierigkeit aus einem *bh* herleiten—umgekehrt ginge es (trotz Paul, a. a. O.) ebenso leicht. Es ist nur die Frage, ob der Übergang auch der betreffenden Sprache und Zeit angepasst ist. *Gelegentliche* physiologische Erklärungen einzelner Lautübergänge sind eben müssige Spielerei, mehr irreführend als klärend. Entweder sollte man das *ganze* Gefüge der Lautentwicklung einer Sprache oder Sprachgruppe vom physiologischen Standpunkte betrachten—oder lieber auf alle "historische Phonetik" verzichten und bei der geheiligten Formel der Buchstaben bleiben.—Doch will ich mich nicht in Polemik verlieren, noch weniger konkrete Beispiele für die nur allzu gebräuchliche Flüchtigkeit phonetischer Erörterungen anführen; lieber will ich mich bemühen, in meinen eigenen Ausführungen über die vorliegende Frage möglichst vorsichtig zu Werke zu gehen.

Jedenfalls betrachte ich bei der Schwäche der angegebenen Gründe einen "Einwurf gegen die Indogermanenschaft von *bh, dh, gh*" nicht mit Ascoli als einen "verzweifelten Versuch"; doch ist es vor allem notwendig, die ganze Frage (mit Ausnahme der durch Curtius und Grassmann fest bewiesenen Vierheit der indogermanischen Artikulationsart der "Verschlusslaute") noch einmal neu aufzurollen.

Zuzugeben ist von vornherein, dass für gewisse Zwecke der vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft (besonders für die Bedeutungslehre und Syntax, zum grossen Teile auch für die Formenlehre) der bisherige Ansatz vollkommen ausreicht. *bh, dh, gh* sind "Formeln," die, im Sinne Delbrücks, schliesslich nur die Ansicht aussprechen, dass das Indogermanische ausser den Medien und den tenues und etwa noch den aspirierten tenues noch eine weitere Art von Konsonanten

[1] Vgl. Vendryes, *Mél. ling. off. à M. A. Meillet*, V, 119: "Une loi phonétique ne peut être reconnue valable que si elle est d'accord avec les principes qui régissent le système articulatoire de la langue au moment où elle agit . . . il n'y a pas de loi phonétique isolée. . . . Aussi y a-t-il un grand intérêt à introduire toujours dans la loi phonétique la notion de *tendance phonétique*."—Ähnlich Verf., *Mod. Phil.*, XI (1913–14), 71–83 ("Sprachwissenschaftliche Ausblicke").

hatte, die in den verschiedenen Sprachen, in der Dentalreihe beispielsweise, als *dh*, *th*, *ð*, *d*, *þ* (*f*) erscheinen. Aber ebenso wie es doch mehr als rein formale Bedeutung hatte, dass Collitz indogermanisch *a*, *e*, *o* an Stelle des dreifach schattierten indogermanischen *a* setzte, so muss es auch als berechtigt gelten, einen Versuch zu machen, dem Lautwert dieser formelhaften ursprachlichen *bh*, *dh*, *gh* auf die Spur zu kommen.

Die Sprachen, in denen die Aspiraten und die einfachen Medien zusammenfallen, sollen vorläufig aus dem Spiele bleiben. Es handelt sich also darum, den ursprachlichen Einheitslaut zu finden, der im Indischen *dh*, im Armenischen *d*, im Griechischen *th*, im Lateinischen *f*>*þ*, im Germanischen *ð* entweder blieb oder wurde.

II. *bh*, *dh*, *gh* als stimmhafte Aspiraten.

7. Indisch.—Dass es sich hier wirklich um stimmhafte Aspiraten, also um Verbindungen von Verschlusslaut mit (stimmhaftem oder stimmlosem) Hauch handelt, ist über allen Zweifel erwiesen. Die Gründe dafür sind bei Wackernagel (*Ai. Gr.*, S. 114) knapp und klar zusammengestellt. In welcher Ausdehnung in den heutigen Dialekten der Hauch stimmhaft oder stimmlos ist, hat für die vorliegende Frage keine Bedeutung. Für die ältere Sprache ist (wie besonders Meringer [a. a. O., S. 143] hervorhebt) stimmhafter Hauch anzunehmen—trotz Hoffory. Die Laute wurden schon von den ältesten europäischen Sanskritisten (z.B. Colebrooke, 1805) mit *bh*, *dh*, *gh* umschrieben und ungefähr in der heutigen Weise erklärt. Im Hindustani, das die arabische Schrift gebraucht, wird eine Verbindung der alphabetischen Medialzeichen mit *h* gebraucht. Nach Arend, Kuhns und Schleichers *Beiträge*, II, 306 (dessen Angaben allerdings von Brand, *AJPh*, I, 148, stark in Zweifel gezogen werden), kommen aspirierte Medien in ungefähr dreissig heutigen indischen Dialekten vor; sonst sind sie entweder zu reinen Medien oder zu *h* geworden. Eine Zusammenstellung von tatsächlichen Beobachtungen gibt Sievers (*Gr.*[5], S. 170 ff.); weitere Bibliographie bei Wackernagel (a. a. O.).

Für alle Fragen des Indischen kommt man mit der bisherigen Annahme selbstverständlich sehr gut aus. Die aspirierende Aussprache dieser Laute, wenn sie schon nicht ursprachlich sein sollte, mag ja immerhin auf eine sehr frühe Periode zurückgehen, die sowohl

vor der Hauchdissimilation als auch vor der Hauchumstellung liegt. Keines der beiden Lautgesetze bietet vom indischen Standpunkt ernstliche physiologische Schwierigkeiten, wenn auch zugegeben werden muss, dass sich keines von beiden mit gänzlich befriedigender Sicherheit lösen lässt, weil uns eben zuverlässige Kenntnis der altindischen Sprechweise jener frühen Zeit fehlt. Für Grassmanns Gesetz muss man sich mit dem ziemlich unbestimmten Begriff "Dissimilation" zufrieden geben, wenn man nicht etwa annehmen will, dass der "Verlust des Hauches" eine Schwächung war, die ursprünglich in solchen Formen eintrat, wo der Akzent auf der zweiten Silbe lag (z.B. in Formen wie *babhúva*, *jaghána*) und erst allmählich auf alle Formen mit zwei Spiranten übertragen wurde. Phonetisch hat das zwar manches für sich, aber das historische Material gewährt, soviel ich sehen kann, für eine solche Annahme keine Stütze, und ausserdem können wir nicht wissen, ob der aus dem Idg. überkommene Druckakzent zu jener Zeit noch stark genug war, eine solche Vermutung zu rechtfertigen.—Eine ziemlich ausreichende Erklärung der Hauchumstellung gibt Bloomfield, *AJPh*, XXXII, 56.—Bei jeder Erwägung dieser und ähnlicher Fragen für die indischen Aspiraten darf vor allem nicht vergessen werden, dass wir es nicht mit echten "Lautverbindungen" zu tun haben, sondern mit Einzellauten, in denen der Atemdruck kräftiger und andauernder ist, als zur blossen Lösung des Verschlusses (der für tenuis fest, für media locker ist) erforderlich wäre. Sobald man mit Max Müller an "konsonantische Diphthonge" denkt, muss man in Schwierigkeiten kommen. Hält man sich aber daran, dass der Unterschied zwischen *b* und *bh* nur in der Stärke und Dauer des Druckes liegt, so ist nichts Merkwürdiges daran, dass z.B. in der Verbindung *bht* der Überdruck erst nach der zweiten statt nach der ersten Verschlusslösung zur Geltung kommt, also (mit progressiver Assimilation) *bdh* eintritt. Sprechen wir doch auch in deutschen Wörtern wie *Pracht, Tracht, Kram* in der Regel unaspiriertes *p, t, k* aus, weil die Vibration des *r* denselben Druck fordert wie eine Aspiration.

Aber eines ist bei den indischen Aspiraten merkwürdig. Oben wurde Ascolis Bemerkung erwähnt, dass die Nachbarsprachen des Sanskrit keine aspirierten Medien besitzen. Für die Dravidastämme ist das richtig; in einheimischen Wörtern ihrer Sprachen kommen

Laute der Art nicht vor; sie werden nur in Entlehnungen aus dem Indischen gebraucht.[1] Sicher macht Ascolis angeführte Stelle den Eindruck, dass er auf diese Tatsache Gewicht legt und vielleicht aus einem gegenteiligen Sachverhalt etwas Ähnliches geschlossen hätte, wie man es für die indischen Zerebrallaute längst vermutet; man nimmt für diese an, dass sie ins Indische aus den Dravidasprachen gekommen seien, welche diese Laute in voller Ausbildung besitzen.[2] Es ist ja natürlich, dass ein derartiges Zusammentreffen einer seltenen Spracheigentümlichkeit in zwei benachbarten, aber nicht verwandten Sprachen den Verdacht der Übernahme aus der einen in die andre erregen muss.

Genau das Gleiche gilt aber *mutatis mutandis* auch von den stimmhaften Aspiraten—nur dass diese noch *viel* seltener sind als die Zerebrallaute. In den meisten Dravidasprachen kommen sie allerdings nicht vor. Wir finden sie aber in den nicht-arischen Dialekten des Himalaya, im Gondi in Zentral-Indien[3] und in der ganzen burmesischen Gruppe, die sich von Hinterindien bis tief nach Bengalen hinein erstreckt;[4] das Tibetanische ferner besitzt aspirierte tenues und *mh*, *nh*, *lh*, *rh*, aber keine aspirierten Medien. Sonst kommen diese anscheinend nirgends auf der Welt als regelrechte Bestandteile des Lautstandes vor.[5] Da nun die in Indien eindringenden Arier mit diesen Völkern schon sehr früh, früher als mit den Dravida, in

[1] Beames, *Comparative Grammar of the Modern Arian Languages in India*, § 274; Byrne, *General Principles of the Structure of Language*, I, 302; Müller, *Grundriss der Sprachwissenschaft*, III, 1, S. 107.

[2] Gabelentz, *Vgl. Sprachwissenschaft*, S. 263; Caldwell, *Grammar of the Dravidian Languages*, II, 32.

[3] Die Gondi sind ein turanisch-dravidisches Mischvolk, nach Hewitt, *Ruling Races of India*, I, 140, und Index, S. 589, vor den Ariern das herrschende Volk Nord-Indiens, bis an den Indus. Sie mögen ihre Aspiraten von der burmesischen Gruppe übernommen haben.—Zur Gondi-Sprache vgl. Beames, a. a. O., S. 274.

[4] Byrne, a. a. O., 490; Müller, a. a. O., S. 278 und 351; Roberts, *Grammar of the Khassi Language*, S. 5 f.—Khassi ist eine Sprache der "Sub-Himalayan Group" im westlichen Assam, nahe der Ganges- und Brahmaputra-Mündung; vgl. Constable, *Hand Atlas of India;* Berghaus, *Atlas der Völkerkunde*, No. 9.—Gabelentz, *Grammatik und Wörterbuch der Khassisprache* (1858), S. 6, spricht dem Khassi nur *bh* als einheimische media aspirata zu, während *gh*, *dh* nur in Fremdwörtern vorkämen. Roberts, a. a. O., (1891), macht keine solche Einschränkung; er findet ausser den aspirierten tenues und Medien auch *rh*, *ngh* im Khassi. Bei der Zwischenstellung dieser Sprache liesse sich ein sicheres Urteil darüber nur auf Grund genauer Kenntnis gewinnen. Häufig scheinen die Aspiraten im Khassi eben nicht zu sein.

[5] Die vereinzelte Lokalaussprache von Aspiraten statt Medien, die Sievers, a. a. O., S. 171, für den armenischen Dialekt von Aštarak erwähnt, darf man sicher nicht hierher rechnen.

Berührung getreten sind, sie wohl unter teilweiser Vermischung mit ihnen zurückgedrängt haben (das Vorkommen der Aspiraten im Gondi macht es wahrscheinlich, dass sich Dravida und Burmesen berührten, ehe sich der indogermanische Keil zwischen sie schob), so kann man wohl kaum umhin, an eine Übertragung der Aspiraten aus den genannten nicht-arischen Sprachen auf das Indische zu denken; der umgekehrte Weg ist schon aus geographischen Gründen so gut wie ausgeschlossen (das Burmesische erstreckt sich viel zu weit nach Osten) und liefe auch dem Erfahrungssatze zuwider, dass Völker einer niederen Kultur von solchen höherer Kultur wohl Lehnwörter, aber nicht Artikulationsgewohnheiten anzunehmen pflegen. Lehnt man die Vermutung einer Übertragung ab, so steht man in weit bestimmterer Weise als bei den Zerebralen vor der seltsamen Tatsache des zufälligen Zusammentreffens der einzigen zwei Völkergruppen, bei denen aspirierte Medien regelmässige Laute sind.

Was lässt sich also aus dem Indischen für die idg. Aussprache von *bh, dh, gh* folgern? Nur dies:

1. Den einzelsprachlichen Verhältnissen des Indischen sind diese Laute vollkommen angemessen; sie müssen es sein, weil sie ihm sicher schon seit sehr alter Zeit angehören.

2. Ausser dem Indischen kommen diese Laute nirgends in der Welt vor als in einigen nicht-arischen Nachbarsprachen des Indischen. Es besteht daher der Verdacht, dass *bh, dh, gh* nicht *indogermanische Laute sind, sondern aus Sprachen der tibetisch-burmesischen Gruppe übernommen wurden.*

3. Sind diesem Wahrscheinlichkeitsgrunde zufolge die aspirierten Medien des Indischen nicht ursprachlich, so *bleiben als weitere Möglichkeit nur Spiranten*, und zwar liegen vom indischen Standpunkte stimmhafte Spiranten am nächsten.

ANM. 1.—Im Februar 1917 hielt ich an der Universität von Texas einen Vortrag, in welchem ich aus inneren Gründen die Meinung vertrat, idg. *bh, dh, gh* seien stimmlose Spiranten gewesen. Dasselbe hatte ich schon ein halbes Jahr früher in der Vorrede meines Buches *Sounds and History of the German Language* niedergeschrieben. Da mir zu jener Zeit keine Bibliothek zur Verfügung stand, war es mir damals nicht bekannt gewesen, dass stimmhafte Aspiraten nur in den angegebenen Sprachen existieren; ich stellte das erst im April in der vorzüglichen sprachwissenschaftlichen Bibliothek der Universität von Chicago fest. Demnach war mir diese Tatsache nicht der

Ausgangspunkt, sondern nur einer Bestätigung und Ergänzung meiner Annahme, dass *bh, gh, dh* nicht der Ursprache angehörten.

Anm. 2.—Bruecke (a. a. O.) und Raumer (*ZföG*, 1888, S. 365) hatten aus den Schriftformen des Devanagari-Alphabetes Schlüsse auf die Aussprache zu ziehen versucht, aber ohne Erfolg. Abweichend von ihnen war es mir schon lange aufgefallen, dass die Buchstaben für die stimmhaften Aspiraten keinerlei Verwandtschaft mit den Zeichen für die Medien zeigen, sondern den stimmlosen Lauten ähneln (besonders in der Zerebralreihe). Aber Versuche in dieser Richtung können zu nichts Bestimmtem führen, weil die Alphabete viel zu jungen Datums sind. Es ist also kein Gewicht darauf zu legen, dass dieser Unterschied sich schon in recht alten Karoṣthi-Formen zeigt, noch auch darauf, dass *ṭ* und *ḍh* in Inschriften des Bengali, Panjabi, Gujerati, *t* und *dh* in den heutigen Alphabeten des Panjabi, Gujerati, Oriya teils ähnlich, teils geradezu gleich sind.

8. Armenisch.—Idg. *bh, dh, gh* werden zu *b, d, g*, während idg. *b, d, g* zu *p, t, k* werden. Das ist auffällig, denn es muss doch wohl im ersten Falle eine Minderung, im zweiten Falle eine Steigerung der Artikulationsenergie bedeuten. Dass für das Germanische das Gleiche angenommen wird, macht die Sache nicht erklärlicher. Eine Entwicklung der armenischen *b, d, g* aus *β̄, ð̄, z̄* würde der allgemeinen Richtung der armenischen Konsonantenentwicklung wohl entsprechen; leiten wir aber diese aus *bh, dh, gh*, ab, so stehen wir wieder vor einer Lautminderung.—Pedersen (*KZ*, XXXIX, 327) nimmt für das Altarmenische noch "unveränderte media aspirata" an, doch reicht man für das von ihm Vorgebrachte mit stimmhafter Spirans ebenso gut aus.

Alles in allem deutet die armenische Lautrichtung auf *stimmhafte Spiranten als Vorstufe von b, d, g*, aber weiter können wir hier vom einzelsprachlichen Standpunkt nicht gehen.

9. Griechisch.—Dass *φ, θ, χ* bis um Christi Geburt aspirierte tenues waren, in denen die als indogermanische tenues aspiratae und mediae aspiratae bezeichneten Laute zusammengefallen waren, darüber ist heute kein Wort mehr zu verlieren.[1] Die Entwicklung der idg. stimmhaften zu den griechischen stimmlosen Aspiraten wird von Ascoli, VL, S. 136) in folgender Weise dargestellt:

Diese Entwicklung, woraus sich auf den ersten Blick ein sonderbarer Zwiespalt zu ergeben scheint, löst sich in Wirklichkeit in eine

[1] Vgl. bes. Brugmann, *GrGr*, S. 124; Hess, *IF*, VI, 123; Thumb, *IF*, VIII, 188; früher wurde mehrfach auch affricata angenommen, so von Ebel, *KZ*, XIII, 265, Bruecke, *ZföG*, 1858, S. 696. Brugmann u.a. setzen affricata nicht als urgriechischen Laut, sondern als Übergangsstufe zu spätgriechisch *f, þ, χ*, an.

gewöhnliche Erscheinung von rückläufiger Assimilation auf, wodurch sich das erste Element der ursprünglichen Affricata dem zweiten homorgan gestaltet; so werden *g-h*, *d-h*, *b-h* zu *k-h*, *t-h*, *p-h* infolge eines Prozesses, welcher nicht verschieden ist von demjenigen, der uns von der etymologischen Kombination *g-s* zu griechisch oder lateinisch *k-s* führt, wie λέξω (*leg-so*), *rex* (*reg-s*), usw. Nach unsrer Ansicht von der Genesis der idg. aspiratae, welche wir bei Beginn der Erörterung berührten, liesse sich die Umwandlung vollständiger darlegen, wenn man sagte, nachdem in der griechischen Sprache die trennende Pause zwischen der tönenden Explosiva und dem tonlosen *h* weggefallen sei, gehe daraus die Vereinigung der beiden Elemente hervor, und dies bringe es notwendig mit sich, dass der Gegensatz ihrer lautlichen Verschiedenheit durch Assimilation behoben werde. Ein analoger Wechsel, wie er zwischen dem Sanskrit und Griechisch eintritt, kehrt wieder zwischen dem heutigen Sanskrit selbst, oder besser zwischen den heutigen prakritischen Volkssprachen und dem zigeunerischen Idiom. Während letzteres in seinem Lautsystem mit Sindhi, dem Hindustanischen und anderen neuindischen Mundarten sanskritischen Stammes vollständig übereinstimmt, trennt es sich von ihnen darin, dass es der aspirierten media beständig die aspirierte tenuis gegenüberstellt, welche dann schliesslich zur reinen tenuis zusammenschrumpft.

Dass Ascolis Erklärung nicht ausreicht, liegt auf der Hand. Sie beruht auf der festen Annahme, *bh*, *dh*, *gh* seien Doppellaute, die aus einem Verschlusslaut und einem *h* bestünden—ja aus einem Zusammentreffen dieser beiden Laute (darauf läuft die erwähnte "Genesis" hinaus) entstanden seien. Das ist eine der früher häufigen Folgerungen aus der Buchstabenformel, die sich so oft weder beweisen noch widerlegen lassen. So ist denn seine Aufstellung zwar nicht glattweg von der Hand zu weisen, umsomehr als sie durch die Parallele der Zigeunersprache gestützt wird, aber sie kann nicht befriedigen. Denn wie man es auch wenden mag—in dem Wandel von *bh* zu *ph* liegt nicht einfache Assimilation, sondern Drucksteigerung; für eine solche aber gibt der griechische Sprachcharakter auch nicht den geringsten Beleg an die Hand, eher das Gegenteil: die Vermutung liegt nahe, dass eine Tendenz zur Drucksteigerung auch zu einer Aspirierung von *p*, *t*, *k* geführt haben würde. So meint denn auch Meyer (*GrGr*, S. 280) vorsichtig, die tenues mit gehauchtem Absatz seien aus den Medialaspiraten "durch einen noch nicht klargestellten Prozess" hervorgegangen. Am ehesten könnte man sich die Sache noch erklären, wenn man mit Meillet (*Introduction*, S. 54) annehmen will, "*une occlusive aspirée est ordinairement douce*"—eine Ansicht, die

er auch sonst öfters ausspricht. Will man das zugeben und sich ausserdem mit der Schwierigkeit abfinden, dass das *h* für das Altindische usw. als stimmhaft, für das Griechische (und Italische) aber als stimmlos gelten muss, so mag man griechisch ϕ, θ, χ als aspirierte stimmlose lenes ansehen, wie in bairisch [b̥hɔltn]=*behalten*. Dann müsste man für das Griechische in der Hauchdissimilation eine Artikulationssteigerung erblicken, was ja wegen der Anlautspannung ganz gut möglich ist. Ich kann mich freilich mit dieser ganzen Annahme mit allen ihren Unsicherheiten nicht befreunden; auch steht ihr das im Wege, dass idg. *ph*, *th*, *kh*, wenn die Andeutung darüber im Anhang dieses Artikels nicht gänzlich fehlgreift, als Verstärkungen von *p*, *t*, *k*, also als entschiedene fortes, aufzufassen sind. Man müsste also zu dem weiteren Notbehelf greifen, bei ihnen Artikulationsschwächung anzunehmen, um ihren Zusammenfall mit idg. *bh*, *dh*, *gh* zu erklären.

Welche andere Herkunft von ϕ, θ, χ wäre denkbar? Einzig und allein Entwicklung aus Spiranten. Dass *stimmhafte* Spiranten zu *ph*, *th*, *kh* wurden, ist ausgeschlossen. Aus *stimmlosen* Spiranten aber entwickeln sich solche Laute nicht selten, wie in § 17 zu zeigen sein wird. Also ergibt das Griechische vorläufig:

1. ϕ, θ, χ aus idg. *bh*, *dh*, *gh* abzuleiten, ist trotz einiger Schwierigkeiten denkbar, wenn es auch auf den Widerstand trifft, dass diese Laute durch das über das Indische Gesagte schon an Wahrscheinlichkeit verloren haben.

2. Von anderen Lauten, die als Vorstufe gelten könnten, *bleiben nur stimmlose Spiranten*. Wie sich diese Annahme bewährt, werden wir später sehen.

10. Italisch.—Wie oben ausgeführt, hat Ascoli die Ansicht begründet, dass das Italische ebenso wie das Griechische (vielleicht sogar mit diesem gemeinsam[1]) *bh*, *dh*, *gh* zu *ph*, *th*, *kh* verwandelte und diese dann weiter (wie z.B. im Germanischen) in *f*, *þ*, *χ* übergingen. Nimmt man die griechische Entwicklung als gesichert an, so ist gegen die italische Wandlung zu aspirierten tenues natürlich vom physiologischen Standpunkt auch nichts einzuwenden, und deren Fortset-

[1] Brugmann, *Z. f. allg. Sprw.*, I, 231, erklärt das Zusammentreffen für zufällig; Kretschmer, Einleitung, S. 156, hält den griechischen Übergang zu *ph*, *th*, *kh* für ziemlich jung, was die auch von ihm bemerkte chronologische Schwierigkeit beseitigen würde; seine Gründe überzeugen aber nicht.

zung als Spiranten findet ja im Spätgriechischen ebenfalls eine genaue Parallele.

Chronologisch freilich stösst man auf eine gewisse Schwierigkeit, die Ascoli selbst schon aufgefallen war (*VL*, 140): "Der gewaltige Zeitraum, um welchen Italien in der Schmälerung der alten Aspiraten zu blossen Spiranten Griechenland vorauseilte, erhellt am besten aus der Tatsache, dass die Osker, die Umbrer und die Latiner es nicht angemessen gefunden haben, für *h* und für *f* das χ und das φ des griechischen Alphabetes zu adoptieren." In der Tat ist der Zeitunterschied ungeheuer gross. Selbst wenn wir, günstigstenfalls, zu der Annahme geneigt sind, dass die Verwandlung von *bh*, *dh*, *gh* zu *ph*, *th*, *kh* im Griechischen und Italischen gleichzeitig vor sich gegangen sei, kommen wir zu dem Schluss, dass die Entwicklung der tenues aspirata zur Spirans im Italischen nur wenige Jahrhunderte, im Griechischen aber mehr als ein Jahrtausend in Anspruch genommen habe. Nun weist allerdings der italische Lautstand stärkeren Druck auf als der griechische (der starke dynamische Akzent ist der beste Beweis dafür), aber so gross scheint der Unterschied vom Griechischen doch nicht zu sein, dass er die Schnelligkeit des Überganges erklärte, die der Wandel *bh*>*ph*>*f*>-*b*- voraussetzt. Dabei muss man für die gemein-italische Substitution des *f* für *ƀ* immerhin auch noch einigen Spielraum gewähren—kurz, wenn man in Betracht zieht, wie ausserordentlich konservativ der italische Konsonantismus im übrigen ist, erscheint diese beispiellose Gewaltsamkeit der angenommenen Entwicklung beinahe unmöglich. Viel anziehender ist es, Ital. *f*, *ƀ*, χ schlankweg als Beibehaltung der idg. Laute zu betrachten, so dass hier wie sonst überall die ital. Konsonanten keine revolutionäre Änderung, sondern konservative Wahrung darstellten.

Anm.—Die aspirierten tenues des Germanischen sind in gänzlich andrer Weise entstanden; sie sind gegenüber den hypothetischen italo-griechischen Aspiraten jedenfalls relativ als fortes zu betrachten. Ein Vergleich der Zeitdauer der Spirantenentwicklung im Italischen und Germanischen führt darum zu nichts.

Ganz undenkbar ist die von Hartmann (*DLZ*, 1890, S. 1831, und 1892, S. 10) angedeutete und von Hermann (*KZ*, XLI, 30) beifällig aufgenommene Ansicht, dass nicht tenuis aspirata, sondern stimmhafte spirans als Zwischenstufe zwischen *bh* und *f* anzunehmen sei.

Denn das würde voraussetzen, dass im Uritalischen β, $\eth$, ζ nicht nur im Anlaut, sondern sogar im intersonantischen Inlaut stimmlos geworden seien—ein Lautwandel, der gänzlich ohne Gleichen dasteht; im Auslaut ist er im Germanischen, Russischen usw. allerdings ganz gewöhnlich, aber in dieser Stellung herrschen vollständig andere Sprechverhältnisse.

Für das Italische kommen wir also zu diesem vorläufigen Ergebnis:

1. Die Ascoli'sche Annahme von *ph* als Zwischenstufe zwischen *bh* und *f* ist lautlich möglich, aber chronologisch auffällig.

2. Stimmhafte Spiranten sind für das Italische ausgeschlossen; *gegen stimmlose Spiranten aber kann vom Italischen aus kein Einwand erhoben werden*, da sie ja tatsächlich vorliegen.

11. Germanisch.—Für das Urgermanische sind (trotz Meillet) stimmhafte Spiranten als Vertreter von idg. *bh*, *dh*, *gh* gesichert—selbstverständlich an und für sich ein phonetisch möglicher Ansatz, nur passt er, ebenso wie beim Armenischen, nicht recht in den Charakter der Lautverschiebung hinein, denn er stellt eine Minderung der Artikulationsenergie dar. Dass auch *ph*, *th*, *kh* Spiranten wurden, ist keine Parallele dazu, wie in den "phonetischen Bemerkungen" (§ 14) deutlich gezeigt werden wird. Bei *ph* ist eine Höchstspannung schon erreicht, weitere Drucksteigerung *muss* zur Spirans führen; bei *bh* aber würde man zunächst eine Spannungserhöhung als Reaktion gegen die Drucksteigerung erwarten, und beide Faktoren zusammen würden eher zu *ph* oder doch *p*, aber sicher nicht zu *b* führen. Für das Griechische und Italische wird ja dieser Übergang tatsächlich behauptet (wenn auch beim Griechischen wenigstens die Voraussetzung des starken Druckes fehlt). Natürlich muss diese ganze Aufstellung unsicher sein, solange der Grundcharakter der angenommenen stimmhaften Aspiraten nicht näher bekannt ist. Die *theoretische Möglichkeit* des Überganges von *bh* zu *b* ist zuzugeben, aber für die Aussprachеweise des Germanischen ist er sehr unwahrscheinlich.

Nicht alle stimmhaften Spiranten des Germanischen kommen aus stimmhaften Aspiraten, sondern viele haben sich unter den Bedingungen von Verners Gesetz aus germanischem *f*, *þ*, χ entwickelt. Der Lautwandel *f*, *þ*, $\chi > \beta, \eth, \zeta$ setzt voraus, dass die ersteren Laute lenes

waren; für die spätere Zeit ist die lenis-Aussprache der germanischen stimmlosen Spiranten allgemein erwiesen, im Inlaut aber wird man sie gerade wegen Verners Gesetz sicher schon für eine sehr frühe Zeit als lenes betrachten dürfen. Das Germanische hat also irgendwann in der vorchristlichen Zeit stimmlose Spiranten mit lenis-Aussprache unter gewissen Bedingungen in stimmhafte Spiranten verwandelt. Später geht dieser Lautwandel über die ursprünglichen Bedingungen von Verners Gesetz noch hinaus. *þ* wird im deutschen Sprachgebiet überhaupt, *s* wenigstens im Norden desselben stimmhaft; *f* wird es im Nordischen und im nordwestlichen Teil des Westgermanischen im Inlaut, teilweise auch im Anlaut, usw. Es besteht also ohne Zweifel —sagen wir vorläufig: eine starke Neigung (die in § 14 näher zu erklären sein wird), stimmhafte Spiranten für stimmlose Spiranten in lenis-Aussprache eintreten zu lassen.

Die beispiellose Einheitlichkeit der germanischen Konsonantenentwicklung lässt es statthaft erscheinen, einmal gegen alle Gesetze der Logik einen Rückschluss von gleichen Wirkungen auf gleiche Ursachen zu wagen und die Hypothese aufzustellen:

Germanisch *ƀ*, *ð*, *ȝ* sind nicht nur unter den Bedingungen von Verners Gesetz, sondern unter *allen* Umständen aus *f*, *þ*, *χ* in lenis-Aussprache hervorgegangen. Diese schwachen stimmlosen Spiranten waren: (*a*) die durch die Lautverschiebung entstandenen germanischen *f*, *þ*, *χ* unter geeigneten Verhältnissen; (*b*) die sogenannten idg. mediae aspiratae unter allen Bedingungen.

Das Germanische deutet also mit einiger Wahrscheinlichkeit darauf hin, dass idg. *bh*, *dh*, *gh stimmlose Spiranten* gewesen sind.

ANM.—Natürlich würde vom reingermanischen Standpunkte nichts im Wege stehen, bei *ƀ*, *ð*, *ȝ* zu bleiben, in ihnen die beibehaltenen ursprachlichen Laute erblickend. Italisch und Griechisch verbieten das aber, und zudem deutet sogar die germanische Lautentwicklung, wie später gezeigt wird, mit ziemlicher Bestimmtheit auf die Herkunft dieser Laute aus den entsprechenden stimmlosen Spiranten.

E. PROKOSCH

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

[*To be continued*]

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVI — *July 1918* — NUMBER 3

PELLES, PELLINOR, AND PELLEAN IN THE OLD FRENCH ARTHURIAN ROMANCES

In the *Romanic Review*, IV (1913), 462 ff., I have combatted the theory of Brugger and others that at some hypothetical earlier stage in the development of the Old French Arthurian romances in prose a Perceval *Queste* held the place which in the existing Vulgate cycle is held by the Galahad *Queste*. In the elaboration of this theory of antecedent cycles,[1] H. O. Sommer, *Modern Philology*,[2] V (1908), 291 ff., and *Romania*, XXXVI (1907), 369 ff., 543 ff., and E. Brugger, *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Litteratur*, XL (1913), 47 ff., note 11, have made the characters named in the title of the present article play no unimportant part.[3] It is my purpose, however, in the following pages to show that we do not have to resort to any theory of hypothetical antecedent cycles to explain the origin of these characters and the occasional inconsistencies and contradictions which we

[1] The only cycle actually preserved, besides the genuine, though fragmentary, de Borron cycle and the Vulgate, is that which the MSS falsely ascribe to Robert de Borron. In the above-mentioned article, pp. 429 ff., 465 ff. (including note 104), I have tried to show—especially with reference to the Mort Arthur and Quest sections—that this cycle is really derived from the Vulgate and not from a common source of the two. Cf., for the Quest section, the valuable article of A. Pauphilet, *Romania*, XXXVI (1907), 594 ff.

[2] The "Galahad and Perceval" text, to which Sommer's discussion is attached, furnishes the approximate original to Malory's Books XI and XII. The text is obviously late and largely based on Part III of the *Lancelot*. E. Wechssler, *Über die verschiedenen Redaktionen des Robert von Borron zugeschriebenen Graal-Lancelot-Cyklus*, pp. 18 f. (Halle, 1895), assumes that it is a part of the *Lancelot* of the pseudo-Robert cycle.

[3] In her *Legend of Sir Perceval*, II, 343, note (London, 1909), Miss J. L. Weston supposes that the successive writers in whose works Pelles and Pellinor appear were drawing independently from oral tradition in regard to these characters. This view, however, has not an iota of evidence in its favor.

find in our manuscript tradition with reference to their relations to one another and to the Grail. As will be seen, I distinguish especially two sets of circumstances as responsible for these inconsistencies or contradictions, the first pertaining to the original authors of the romances, the second to the scribes or redactors.

1. The different romances, or "branches," as our MSS commonly call them, which make up the Vulgate cycle were, generally speaking, composed by different men,[1] and the successive authors might, either through faults of memory or intentionally, introduce innovations in respect to previously existing characters, or, for some reason or other, invent new characters outright. For, after all, these romances, though connected with each other in a way, were also separate works, and each author exercised more or less the liberty of invention, without any idea of maintaining a strict scientific accuracy in harmonizing his own branch with the branches of his predecessors. Very frequently, no doubt, while composing, such an author would not have the latter works at hand, but even if he had them and were disposed to establish exact conformity with the other branches it would not always be an easy task to look up a particular point.

2. On their own responsibility the scribes occasionally attached to the names they were copying anticipatory references or descriptive phrases relating to other branches, or drawn therefrom.[2] In making these insertions they doubtless depended mainly on memory, and hence the references and phrases, being not always correctly applied, gave rise to inconsistencies and contradictions. Moreover, inasmuch as at the time that our extant MSS were copied all the branches of the cycle were already in existence, a branch like the *Queste*, which stands late in the series, was just as subject to interpolation of this kind from a branch like the *Merlin* (including continuation), which stands earlier, as vice versa. Such contamination of the text may be due also to the influence of other romances besides those of the Vulgate cycle—such romances, for example, as Chrétien's *Perceval* or the *Merlin* continuation (*Livre d'Artus*) of

[1] Miss Weston, *Legend of Sir Lancelot*, p. 139 (London, 1901), argues that *Queste* and *Grand St. Graal* (*Estoire del Saint Graal*) are by the same author. So, too, Brugger, *Zs. f. frz. spr. u. Litt.* XXIX (1905), 89, note 45.

[2] Of course, they sometimes took larger liberties than these with their texts, recasting, interpolating passages of varying length, etc., but I am concerned here merely with the shorter additions.

MS 337. Theoretically, indeed, there is no reason why we should not find in our MSS scribal insertions drawn from romances of the pseudo-Robert de Borron cycle, or the *Perlesvaus*, or even the prose *Tristan*, since these romances were doubtless already in existence before the archetype MS of any branch of the Vulgate cycle, as we have it today, was written. For it should not be forgotten: (*a*) that from fifty to sixty years must have elapsed between the composition of the latest member of the Vulgate cycle and the date of our earliest extant manuscript of any part of that cycle, during which period these romances, the most popular works of their age, must have undergone very frequent transcription;[1] (*b*) that the archetype of our MSS of any branch of the Vulgate cycle does not necessarily represent that branch as it was originally composed.[2] All extant MSS go back to copies which had been adjusted to the cyclic form, wherever such adjustments seemed still required, and these particular copies may have been altered in passages from the original form of the individual romance, to say nothing of omissions. Hence a corruption or interpolation may run through a large number even of the best MSS or, indeed, through them all.

In view of the varying conceptions of the different romancers as to the functions or relationships of particular characters, and in view, also, of the frequent difficulty they must have encountered in consulting the texts concerned, one may say that it was the most natural thing in the world, if the scribes did introduce into their texts such contradictions and inconsistencies as I have indicated above. After some twenty years of editing Arthurian texts, Dr. Sommer speaks[3] of Perceval as being nephew of the Fisher King in Chrétien's *Perceval*, whereas he is really his cousin (cf. ll. 6377 ff.), and interprets as

[1] We know that the *Estoire del Saint Graal*, which there is every reason to believe was the latest part of the cycle, except the *Merlin* continuation, was composed by 1216. See my discussion of the subject, *Romanic Review*, III (1912), 185 ff. On the other hand, the earliest dated MS, and probably as early a MS as any extant of any part of the Vulgate cycle, viz. MS 342 of the Bibliothèque nationale, is from the year 1274. Cf. the description of it in my edition of the *Mort Artu*, p. xv.

[2] Brugger, *Zs. f. frz. Spr. u. Litt.*, XL, 48, note, has made this remark with regard to the *Lancelot*, and I have pointed out the same thing with regard to the *Queste* (*Romanic Review*, IV, 466 ff.).

[3] *Modern Philology*, V, 295. Note, too, how Sir John Rhŷs, throughout his *Studies in the Arthurian Legend* (Oxford, 1891), unsuspectingly accepts the blunder of the Welsh translator of the *Perlesvaus*, who made a King Peleur (a proper name) out of the Old French *roi pescheör*.

Perceval's father the wrong Pellinor[1] in the *Livre d'Artus* of MS 337, as will be seen later in this article. In such cases, we do not jump to the conclusion that Dr. Sommer had access to lost versions of these romances. Why, then, should we do so when we come across similar blunders in the work of a mediaeval copyist who, in transcribing some passage, took upon himself for the nonce the functions of an editor? In criticizing Miss Weston, Brugger observes:[2] "Wenn einzelne Kopisten Widersprüche tilgen, so entstehen dadurch noch nicht jüngere Redaktionen." But the converse is equally true: "Wenn einzelne Kopisten Widersprüche einführen, so entstehen dadurch noch nicht *ältere* Redaktionen."[3]

Owing to the circumstances which I have just described, the problem of ascertaining what is original in our texts and what is not is extremely complex, but until we have attempted a solution with a full consideration of these undeniable conditions we are not justified in taking refuge in theories of lost versions.

Let us examine now the occurrence of these three characters in the romances.

I. *Pelles.*

Pelles was, no doubt, the creation either of the author of the *Queste* or of one of the authors[4] of Part III (often called the *Agravain*) of the prose *Lancelot*, viz., of those portions of Part III which relate to the begetting of Galahad and which prepare for the achievements of that character as narrated in the *Queste*. Brugger, to be sure, says[5] that he first appeared in the hypothetical redaction of the

[1] *The Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, VII, 243, note 1 (Washington, D.C., 1913).

[2] *Zs. f. frz. Spr. u. Litt.*, XXX (1906), 177, note.

[3] R. Heinzel, *Über die französischen Gralromane*, pp. 65 f., note (Wien, 1891), has discussed in detail the characters, Pelles, Pellehem, and Pellinor. He has made allowance in a considerable measure for scribal confusions, but does not attempt to fix definitely the origin of each character. In a study like the present, one is hampered seriously, of course, by the want of critical editions of the romances involved. The genealogy of the MSS has not been worked out for any branch of the Vulgate cycle, except, after a fashion, for the earlier part of the *Lancelot*, by Professor E. Wechssler's pupils in the *Marburger Beiträge zur romanischen Philologie*, 1911, *et seq.* The only record we have of the variant forms of the names in particular passages is that which Dr. Sommer has given us in the notes of his *Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, and that is not complete.

[4] The authors here distinguished may possibly be one and the same person. I expect to discuss this question in a forthcoming article on the composition of the prose *Lancelot*.

[5] *Zs. f. frz. Spr. u. Litt.*, XL, 48, note.

Perlesvaus which figures in his theory of the evolution of the prose romances. But, in questions like this, one cannot be expected to accept appeals to indefinite hypothetical redactions, especially as in the above-mentioned article I have endeavored to refute the contention which seems to be the main reason for Brugger's hypothesis of an earlier form of the *Perlesvaus*—namely, that a Perceval *Queste* once held the place in the Vulgate cycle which the Galahad *Queste* does in all the extant MSS. The only *Perlesvaus* we know—that which is preserved in the MSS—is, in my judgment, a very late romance. Birch-Hirschfeld gave substantial reasons for this conclusion forty years ago in his *Sage vom Gral*, pp. 135 ff.,[1] and one

[1] His views were accepted by Alfred Nutt, *Studies on the Legend of the Holy Grail*, p. 64; by A. Jeanroy, in his review of Nitze's *Perlesvaus* in the *Revue Critique*, Oct. 10, 1904; by W. Foerster, who added a new argument from the name *Perlesvaus*, see *Kristian von Troyes: Wörterbuch zu seinen sämtlichen Werken*, Introduction, p. 186 (1914); and by others. See W. A. Nitze's dissertation, *The Old French Grail Romance Perlesvaus*, pp. 20 ff., for a summary of opinions pro and con on the subject up to 1902. Nitze does not indicate, however, that Heinzel was inclined to accept even Gerbert (who wrote probably about 1220) as a source of the *Perlesvaus*. But cf. Heinzel's *Über die französischen Gralromane*, p. 172. Nitze, himself, puts it between 1200 and 1212, which, in my opinion, is too early. He has returned to the subject in his article, "Glastonbury and the Holy Grail." *Modern Philology*, I (1903), 247 ff., but his conclusions depend on an acceptance, among other things, of the genuineness of early Arthurian traditions at Glastonbury, which, in my judgment, has been disproved by W. W. Newell, "William of Malmesbury on the Antiquity of Glastonbury," *Publications of the Modern Language of America*, XVIII (1903), 459 ff. The passage from Johannes Glastoniensis (fifteenth century), communicated by Baist and quoted by Nitze, note 2, seems to me a mere compilation of details from the romances and from chronicles that have no necessary connection with the supposed early Arthurian traditions at Glastonbury, which at that time Nitze accepted. Moreover, in this article, pp. 252 f., Nitze has discussed *Pelles* briefly, but Sommer's recent *Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, seven vols. (Washington, D.C., 1908–13), which makes the *Lancelot* accessible for the first time and which gives for the *Grand St. Graal* (*Estoire del Saint Graal*) and *Queste* a fuller record of MS readings than had been previously available, puts new materials at our disposal for the study of these questions, and if my solution of them on the basis of such materials is correct, it will be a sufficient answer to Nitze's interpretation of Pelles' origin and development in the Grail romances. I will only add that when the Welsh version of the *Queste* makes Pelles' daughter marry Lancelot, this change from the story as told in the MSS of the Vulgate cycle is, in my opinion, introduced by the author merely in the interests of a higher morality. I see no reason either to believe that the *Perlesvaus* ever existed in a (lost) Latin form. The only Latin Arthurian romances we know of, the *Historia Meriadoci* and *De Ortu Waluuanii* (see my edition of these romances, Halle, 1913), besides being relatively short, are late, and based on earlier French romances. *Arthur and Gorlagon*, edited by G. L. Kittredge (Boston, 1903), is merely a Welsh folktale in Latin dress. Even that, however, exists only in a late fourteenth century MS.

As against the remarks which I have just made, it should be said that Nitze expects soon to publish some new external evidence in support of his dating of the *Perlesvaus*, which, for the rest, was accepted by W. Golther in his review of the above-mentioned dissertation, *Zs. f. frz. Spr. u. Litt.*, XXVI[2] (1903), 12 ff., and apparently by G. Paris, *Littérature française au moyen âge* (Bibliography, § 60), as confirming his own well-known views on the place of the *Perlesvaus* among the Grail romances. Quite recently, in *Studies in Philology*, XV, 7 ff. (University of North Carolina, 1918), Nitze has again endeavored to establish an intimate connection between the *Perlesvaus* and Glastonbury. The

may add other evidence to that effect, as, for example, its dependence on the *Lancelot* with reference to Claudas and to Lancelot's relations with Guinevere. Note, too, such details as the absurdity of Perceval's alighting under an olive tree in Great Britain(!)[1] (Potvin, I, 198), imitated from Wauchier, ll. 17595, 18247, 18562, 18609, 18670,[2] the Castle of Copper episode in the *Perlesvaus*, which is derived from the episode of Dolerouse Garde[3] in the *Lancelot*, III, 144, 151, 191, the scar on Lohot's forehead (Potvin, I, 222), imitated from Gerbert (Potvin, VI, 200, scar on Perceval's forehead). In his review (*Revue*

evidence which he has adduced proves, I think, that the author of the *Perlesvaus* was trying to identify Avalon with Glastonbury, but his knowledge is too inexact for a resident of the place, or, indeed, for any one who had visited it. For example, if we accept with Nitze the mountain of the romance, p. 261, as meant for the Tor (the hill which rises up so abruptly from the surrounding country at Glastonbury)—and this seems to me, too, most probable—the placing of the Lady Chapel on it, as Nitze, himself, has pointed out, p. 12, would be incorrect. Moreover, the *Perlesvaus* tells us, p. 261, that there were houses with *vergiers* and *clos* on this mountain. But on the steep cone of the Tor there is no room for these things. Accepting the identification of Avalon and Glastonbury in the *Perlesvaus*, we have, as Nitze says, a *terminus a quo* for the dating of that romance, viz., 1191 (the year of the pretended exhumation of Arthur and Guinevere at Glastonbury), but nothing more, as far as I can see. I had already pointed out the same thing (*Revue Celtique*, XXXIII, 432, note, and *The Romanic Review*, IV, 454, including note 76) with reference to the Vulgate *Mort Artu*, in which the author awkwardly combines the old Celtic tradition concerning Arthur's translation to Avalon with the new idea, started in 1191 by the monks of Glastonbury, that he was buried at the abbey there. The only difference here between the *Mort Artu* and *Perlesvaus*, in my opinion, is that the author of the latter tried to introduce some local details into his description, and blundered in doing so. Since this note was put in type, I have observed that the description, *Perlesvaus*, p. 261, corresponds strikingly, in many essential details, to that of the visit of Gawain and Hector, first to the chapel on the mountain and then to the hermitage, similarly situated in *Queste* VI, 106–11. So, after all, instead of being local, the details in *Perlesvaus* are probably borrowed from the *Queste*.

[1] The description of Perceval (Potvin, I, 37), "Il a chief d'or et regart de lion, et nombril de virge pucele, et cuer d'acier, et cors d'olifant, et tesches sanz vileinnie," is virtually identical with the description of Galahad, *Lancelot*, IV, 27, but this description of Galahad, like all the materials relating to that character in the *Lancelot*, could not have belonged to the romance in its original form, and is, of course, interpolated. The interpolation was drawn, no doubt, from the *Perlesvaus*, like other references and interpolations in our *Lancelot* MSS. See my remarks in *The Romanic Review*, IV, 469 f. and in my article "The Composition of the Old French prose *Lancelot*," which is soon to appear in the same review. We find the above description (applied to Perceval) again in the *Livre d'Artus* of MS. 337, VII, 52.

[2] P. Paris, *Romans de la Table Ronde*, II, 306, note, states that "olivier" in the romances written in Northern France always means "willow," but this seems very questionable. Wauchier, doubtless, took this feature over mechanically from *Chansons de geste* that dealt with Southern France.

The idea of "li Chevaliers au Cercle d'Or" in the *Perlesvaus*, Potvin, I, 281 ff. and 241 ff., may have been suggested by Patrides au Cercle d'Or of the *Lancelot*, IV, 266, 294 f., 300. A knight of the same name (nephew of Baudemagus), and, in reality, probably identical with this Patrides, is given, *Lancelot*, V, 337, a crown of laurel as a reward of valor. Later, V, 387 ff. he is freed from captivity by Perceval. In Chrétien's *Erec*, l. 1712, we have, already, it is true, a "a Vallez au cercle d'or," but he is a mere name.

[3] I have already dealt with this matter in *Modern Philology*, X, 10 ff.

Critique for Oct. 10, 1904) of Nitze's *Perlesvaus* dissertation, A. Jeanroy has also pointed out the indebtedness of that romance to the *Vengeance de Raguidel*.[1]

Assuming then that the *Perlesvaus* is of comparatively late date, I will say that the circumstances under which the character of Pelles was created, it seems to me, were as follows: In Chrétien's *Perceval*, ll. 3471 ff., 4633 ff., we have the unnamed Fisher King, who is at the same time the Maimed King. But we are left to infer that the Fisher King's father (unnamed) is also maimed, for it is said (ll. 6391 ff.) that he had not quitted the mysterious Grail chamber for fifteen years.

Now, the authors of the *Queste* and of the passages involved in *Lancelot*, Part III (to use, for convenience' sake, Sommer's division of the *Lancelot*), were contented with one Maimed King as well as with one Fisher King, and they kept as the Maimed King the strange character who had not left his room for fifteen years, while they rationalized to some degree the real Lord of the Grail Castle, the Fisher King, whose rather active participation in the story hardly admitted of disability through lameness,[2] and conferred on him a definite name, Pelles. They did not, however, make the new Fisher King, Pelles, the son of their Maimed King, probably owing to Pelles' somewhat rationalized character. They left the relationship undefined. The conflict thus brought about between Chrétien's conceptions of the functions and relationship of the two characters and those of the *Queste* and *Lancelot*, Part III, is the source of constant confusion for scribes and redactors, as we shall soon see, and possibly even for the authors themselves.

Furthermore, it is only by bringing together passages widely separated in Chrétien (3471 ff., on the one hand, and 6378 ff. on the other) that we can establish the identity of the Fisher King with the Maimed King. No doubt, in imitation of Chrétien and to

[1] As regards the relations of the *Perlesvaus* and the Vulgate *Merlin*, we have in our MSS of the latter, II, 316, an undoubted allusion to the *Perlesvaus* (Kai's killing of Arthur's son, Lohot). Cf. Brugger, *Zs. f. frz. Spr. u. Litt.*, XXXIII, 192 (1908), and my discussion, *The Romanic Review*, III (1912), 183 f.

[2] In Wauchier, too (cf. ll. 20100 ff.), the Lord of the Grail Castle is not lame, and Wauchier's influence may possibly be responsible, in part, for this feature of the passages under discussion.

maintain the impression of mystery, the authors of the prose romances adopt this device (which with Chrétien was probably not intentional) and rarely identify Pelles in so many words as the Fisher King. There resulted an obscurity which proved a trap to would-be scribal editors.

There are three passages which seem to conflict with this interpretation of the evidence in regard to Pelles' origin and his function in the above-mentioned romances.

1. As just stated, in the *Queste* and in all episodes of Part III (Vol. V of Sommer's *Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*) of the *Lancelot* that involve Grail matters,[1] Pelles is the more or less rationalized reproduction of Chrétien's Fisher King. In V, 303, to our surprise, however, when Bohort (Bors) is visiting the Grail Castle, Pelles, who plays throughout this third division of the *Lancelot* the part of Fisher King[2] and Lord of the Grail Castle and who had actually been referred to as *le roy pescheour* at p. 191, asks him (Bohort) whether he has seen his (Pelles') father, and on Bohort's replying that he does not know him, says: "cest li roys mahaignies que on apele le roy pesc(h)eor, le plus hardi cheualier & le plus preudomme qui fust a son tamps." When Bohort next inquires how Pelles' father became thus maimed, Pelles replies: "Sire, ce fu par le forfait quil fist quant il traist lespee du fuerre qui ne deuoit estre traite deuant que cils le trairoit qui les auentures del saint graal doit achieuer & pour chou fu [il] ferus parmi lez .ij. cuisses de lespee et naura ia garison deuant chou que li boins cheualiers uendra." And it appears from the next paragraph that the wound was inflicted by a lance.

Sommer cites five MSS here that agree with the text just quoted, but does not say whether this agreement runs through all the MSS. In any event, the whole passage, whether it is an interpolation or not,

[1] All references in this article to the romances of the Vulgate cycle are to Sommer's edition. From this point on I will cite merely by volume, omitting Sommer's name and the title of his edition.

[2] On the other hand, the term Fisher King is only once actually applied to him in Part III of the *Lancelot*, namely, at V, 191, when Lancelot is telling his adventures at Arthur's court, in order that they might be written down. The term is applied also, p. 192, to the King of the Grail Castle in the narrative of Gawain's adventures; but it is to be recalled that in the original narrative of these adventures, prose *Lancelot*, IV, 343 ff., Pelles did not appear, nor was there anything said about a *roi pescheor*.

refers, beyond dispute, to the passage in the *Queste*, VI, 150, where it is related how the Maimed King became maimed. This passage in the *Queste* agrees with V, 303, in all but three particulars: (1) The Maimed King (as nowhere else in the *Queste*) bears here a definite name, which varies with the different MSS. (2) It offers no identification of Maimed King and Fisher King. (3) The Maimed King is not said to be Pelles' father.

The author of the passage V, 503, had then this passage of the *Queste* in mind, but in using it he confounds its conceptions with those of Chrétien's *Perceval*, in which a maimed king, as will be remembered, is the Fisher King (cf. ll. 3471 ff., 4633 ff.), who bears throughout no definite name, and in which the father of the Fisher King (the latter rôle being that which Pelles himself really plays in the *Lancelot*) is also maimed (cf. ll. 6391 ff.). This introduces into the narrative a confusion which an interpolator, it would seem, would be more likely to be guilty of than the writer of the romance, but, in any event, the contamination just spoken of is manifestly the source of the confusion. The author of the passage was, no doubt, trying to harmonize the narrative of Gawain's visit to the Grail Castle (Corbenic) in the *Lancelot*, IV, 343 ff., with that of Lancelot's visit to the same place, V, 107 ff. In the former, the Lord of the Grail Castle who receives Gawain is the Maimed King, and there is no mention of Pelles; in the latter, conditions are just reversed, for here Pelles is the host, and there is no mention of the Maimed King.[1] In neither account of the visit is the term, "Fisher King" used of the Lord of the Grail Castle, and this is only applied to that personage (who is Pelles throughout the *Lancelot* and *Queste*, except in the narrative of Gawain's visit) at V, 191 f., where Lancelot recites at court his adventures. In his effort, however, to harmonize these narratives he also endeavored to explain who the Maimed King was, drawing on the *Queste*, VI, 150, for this purpose, but confounding, as we have seen, the conceptions of this passage of the *Queste* with those of Chrétien's *Perceval*.

2. Pelles, then, is the Fisher King of *Lancelot*, Part III, although he is only distinctly so called at V, 191. In the *Queste* the identification is plainer, for in that branch, wherever the term *roi pescheor*

[1] In the forthcoming article on the composition of the *Lancelot*, referred to above, I shall attempt to explain the difference between the narratives of these two visits.

is used, Pelles is named or implied. The passages are VI, 5 (so the best MSS), 98, 114. But there is one exception to the rule, viz., VI, 8, where Galahad speaks of "mon oncle le roy Pelles et mon aiol le riche roi pescheor." This is, perhaps, the worst *crux* in the whole range of the prose romances, and certainly involves some blunder on the part of scribe or redactor. It seems to me most probable that the person who introduced into our manuscript tradition this impossible reading had before him simply "mon oncle le roy Pelles," where "oncle," as occasionally elsewhere in Old French, meant "grandfather."[1] This person, misunderstanding "oncle" as meaning "uncle," and remembering, nevertheless, that Galahad was always represented as the grandson of the Fisher King, made him send greetings, too, to this grandfather (aiol). As a matter of fact, Pelles and the Fisher King were, of course, one and the same person.[2]

3. Pelles, is, as we have seen above, the Fisher King,[3] but not the Maimed King, in the *Lancelot* and the *Queste*. In one passage, however, *Queste*, VI, 150, he is identified with the Maimed King in a considerable number of MSS. In this passage the writer is explaining how the Maimed King became maimed—viz., by a mysterious lance, as he was drawing the *espee as estranges renges* from its scabbard. "In the majority of the existing MSS," says Sommer (*loc. cit.*, note), the Maimed King is here called Pelles; in MSS M and R, Pellinor;

[1] R. Heinzel, *Über die französischen Gralromane*, p. 66, note, who gives examples from other Arthurian texts, so interprets the word in this passage; so also does E. Brugger in the above-cited article, p. 47, note. "Oncle" acquired, doubtless, this additional signification, because of the double meaning of the word for "nephew," *nies, neueu*, which, like its Latin etymon, *nepos, nepotem*, could mean "grandson" as well as "nephew." As Heinzel and Brugger remark, when Pelles in the *Queste*, VI, 187, calls Galahad his *neueu*, this certainly means "grandson"; for Pelles, wherever he appears in the Arthurian romances, is always the father of Galahad's mother. Cf. for the *Queste* alone, VI, 5, 9, 16, 98, 99, 182. Sommer, VI, 187, having himself only recently discovered the varying meanings of Old French *nies, neueu*, imagines that no Grail student had ever observed this before him. But his discovery has done him little good, for he still prefers the rendering, "nephew."

[2] The passage reads as I have given it according to Sommer in the MS on which his edition is based (British Museum, Additional, 10294), as also in MSS. A (B. M. Additional 17443), C (B. M. Royal 20, C. VI), G (B. M. Royal 14, E. III) and R (B. M. Royal 19, C. XIII). M (Bibliothèque Nationale, 342) has "monsignor le roi pelles & mon aiol le riche roi pescheor." The variant of M would leave the main difficulty untouched. These are the only MSS of which Sommer gives any record.

[3] It is true that MS C in *Queste*, VI, 13, identifies the Maimed King with the Fisher King, who in this romance is Pelles, and *ibid.*, p. 186, identifies Pelles with the Maimed King, but these are isolated variants which arose, no doubt, through Chrétien's influence. MS R possibly supports C in regard to the first of these passages.

in A, Parlan (= Pellehan ?); in C, Urbains = Urlains of *Queste*, VI, 156, no doubt, who was the enemy of the Maimed King's father, but suffered a fate like that of the Maimed King himself, owing to which circumstance the scribe of C confounded the two. But everywhere else in the *Queste*, Pelles is entirely distinct from the Maimed King, and, as Sommer suggests, the reading "Pelles" here is, without doubt, incorrect. To be sure, as the Maimed King nowhere else in the *Queste* is given a specific name, it is equally safe to assert that the names given to that personage in the other MSS in this passage are likewise unauthorized. I have already explained the variant (Urbains) of C. The reading (Parlan) of A is due most likely to the scribe's recollection of the *Estoire del Saint Graal*, I, 290, where the Maimed King is in some MSS called Pelleam (Pellehan). Pellinor, in MSS M and R, was suggested most probably by the *Merlin* continuation of the Vulgate cycle or of MS 337 (*Livre d'Artus*), for outside of the late pseudo-Robert de Borron cycle and prose *Tristan* and the reading of these two MSS in the present passage the name is only known to the two *Merlin* continuations—in each as the name of a maimed king. The passages in the mind of the scribe or redactor were most probably Vulgate *Merlin*, II, 125, 159, or *Livre d'Artus* of MS 337, VII, 146, 243—passages which we shall have to return to in another connection.

But how did it happen that in this one passage of the *Queste* all the MSS should concur in giving the Maimed King a definite name? This was probably due to a blunder in the archetype of the extant MSS.[1] The scribe of the archetype either from sheer confusion of mind or laboring under the influence of Chrétien, who, as we have seen, identified Fisher King and Maimed King, for the moment

[1] With regard to my assumption of a blunder in the archetype, this is not so hazardous a conjecture as it might seem at first blush, for, indisputably, the slaying of Baudemagus by Gawain was wanting in this archetype. The incident of the slaying is essential to the narrative and must originally have been a part of the Vulgate *Queste*, but it is not found in any extant MS of the Vulgate cycle, although, as I pointed out in my edition of the Vulgate *Mort Artu*, p. 266, it is preserved in MS 112 of the Bibliothèque Nationale. In any case, we face here a blunder of scribe or redactor, for nowhere else in the *Queste* or *Lancelot* is the Maimed King named.

In the manuscript tradition of Chrétien's *Yvain*, 11. 907 ff., we have an exact parallel to the corruption which I here surmise for the *Queste*—blunder in the archetype with attempts to emend on the part of later redactors (or translators), which increase the confusion. Cf. W. Foerster's note to these lines in his small *Yvain*, 4th edition (Halle, 1912). Foerster cites there also other instances in the manuscript tradition of Chrétien's *Erec* and *Cligès*.

accepted the Maimed King as identical with the Fisher King, who in the *Queste* was Pelles, and so called him Pelles. Later scribes, observing that this was inconsistent with the general conception of the *Queste*, substituted, as stated above, names given the Maimed King in other branches of the cycle: Pellinor, drawn from a *Merlin* continuation, either that of the Vulgate or of MS 337 (see pages cited at the end of the last paragraph), or Pelleam, *Estoire del Saint Graal*, I, 290, or, in the case of MS C, from the *Quèste* itself, Urbain (Urlain), VI, 146, owing to the blunder which I have already explained.

As regards the origin of the name, Pelles, I have no doubt that, like a very large percentage of the names in the prose romances, it was fabricated by the author of the romance which first introduced him into literature.[1] This author made the name of his new Grail King alliterate with that of Chrétien's Grail Knight, Perceval,[2] as was often done in such cases. Perhaps, *Perlesvaus*, *Pellesvaus*, had already arisen as an occasional variant of Perceval's name. Or, possibly, *Pelles* may be an approximation to *Peleus* (*Pelleus*), name of the father of the great Greek hero, Achilles, in the *Roman de Troie*. Some of the most

[1] This is Brugger's explanation of *Pellean* and *Pellinor* (as modeled on *Pelles*). Cf. his above-mentioned article, p. 48, note. His explanation is evidently correct, but I have no doubt that the same explanation applies to Pelles, too. W. Foerster maintained that even the name, *Perceval*, was Chrétien's invention. See his Chrétien *Wörterbuch*, Introduction, p. 165.

The late Sir John Rhŷs, *Studies in the Arthurian Legend*, pp. 273 ff. (Oxford, 1891), tried, on the other hand, to derive *Pelles* from *Pwyll*, name of the Welsh Otherworld prince, but the argument to me as to Heinzel (see his Grail treatise, p. 66, note), is not convincing. Nitze, however, accepts and adds to it in his above-quoted article, p. 254, and again, *PMLA*, XXIV, 379, note 2.

[2] Brugger, in the note just quoted, gives examples of this practice of the Old French romances from other texts. It makes no difference that in the Vulgate cycle, except in one corrupt passage of the *Lancelot*, III, 29, where Perceval is said to be Pelles' son, the blood relationship of the two characters is of the most shadowy kind. They were both intimately connected with the Grail, and that was enough.

On the subject of this blood relationship it is to be observed that the author of the *Queste* of the Vulgate cycle, having displaced Chrétien's Perceval by Galahad as the Grail Knight, was disposed to obscure altogether Perceval's connection with the Grail King. (In Chrétien, 6377 ff. Perceval was nephew of the mysterious person who was served by the Grail, father of the Fisher King.) Consequently, the only direct recognition of the original connection between Perceval and the Fisher King or his father is to be found in two passages of the *Queste*, (*a*) VI, 53, where Perceval's aunt speaks of herself as once queen of the *terre gastee*, in which, of course, the Grail Castle (Corbenic) was situated; (*b*) VI, 59, where this aunt speaks to Perceval of Pelles as "uostre parent." Even when, VI, 187, Galahad, Perceval, and Bohort come to Corbenic, Pelles recognizes Galahad as his *neueu*, but no intimation is given that he (Pelles) was related to Perceval.

Sommer suggests, VI, 188, note 3, that Pelles' saintly *niece* there mentioned is "Perceval's sister come to life again." But this cannot be, for the death of Perceval's sister had been fully related, p. 171. Consequently, this passage furnishes no indication of Pelles' relationship to Perceval.

prominent names in the Arthurian prose romances, e.g., *Hector*, *Palamades*, are taken from this source.[1]

Having determined now, as I hope, the origin and position of Pelles in *Lancelot*, Part III, and the *Queste*, I need not dwell at length on this character as he is found in the other texts.

In the whole of *Lancelot*, Part II, his name does not occur at all, in Part I but twice, viz., III, 29, 117. It is to be remembered that the two parts embrace 792 large octavo pages in Sommer's edition and that even the second of these mere allusions—for they are nothing more—is separated by 782 such octavo pages from the passage in Part III where the name next occurs. Under these circumstances, I have, for my own part, no doubt that Pelles was unknown to the authors of the earlier portions of the *Lancelot* and that the incidental allusions to him there are really interpolated under the influence of the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation in which his name occurs so frequently—definitely, under the influence of the passage, II, 159, which I shall have to discuss more fully in a moment in connection with the name Pellinor. In III, 29, we have the same comparison of Guinevere's beauty to that of Elaine sans per and Galahad's mother, which occurs

[1] Pelles is called *Pelles de la terre Foraine* in the *Lancelot*, Part III. Cf. V, 107, 122. In neither passage is he called king of the Terre Foraine, but his daughter (Galahad's mother) is referred to, p. 106, as "fille le roy de la terre foraine," so he is king of that country. As remarked above, this trick of leaving scattered in different parts of the text the various elements that are necessary to establish the identity of a character is habitual with the authors of the Grail romances. Similarly Corbenic is in the Terre Foraine, but this is not expressly stated anywhere.

Apart from the three passages just cited, there is only one other mention of the Terre Foraine in *Lancelot*, Part III, viz., V, 246, where it is said that Lancelot's grandfather (Lancelot) was king of "la blanche terre qui marchist a la terre foraine." Cf. also the variant in MS R at p. 243.

In the rest of the *Lancelot* we have only one occurrence of a Terre Foraine, viz., IV, 163. But here the name is applied to the kingdom of Baudemagus—*Gorre*, as Chrétien calls it. I believe that at least the passages of *Lancelot*, Part III, in which Pelles figures are by a different hand from the earlier parts of the *Lancelot*, and am inclined to think that the author of these Pelles episodes derived the name from IV, 163. There is no allusion to the Terre Foraine anywhere in the *Queste*. In the *Mort Artu*, it is mentioned three times as one of Lancelot's dominions, VI, 292, 304, 316, and unconnected with Pelles. In the *Estoire del Saint Graal* the name is found once, I, 286, as the land which was settled by Alain and his brothers and in which the Grail Castle (Corbenic) was built. In the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation it also occurs once, II, 384, in connection with the Maimed King, Alain—"Helain de la Terre Foraine."

In the opening pages of the *Queste*, VI, 3, 5, we have Pelles de Listenois. This appelation is found in the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation, II, 125, 159, 221, 352, 359, 384, 388 (implied), 395, 422, and nowhere else in the Vulgate cycle, save III, 117 (*Lancelot*, Part I), where interpolation from the Vulgate *Merlin* is manifest, since Alain li Gros is his brother. I suspect that the "de Listenois" of VI, 3, 5, is due also to influence of the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation.

nowhere else save in II, 159. Similarly, in III, 117, we have Pelles de Listenois and Alain as brothers, as is the case in II, 159, 221, and elsewhere in the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation.

In the *Mort Artu*, Pelles is mentioned only twice, VI, 219, 303, as father of Galahad's mother and Eliezer, respectively. The two references to the *roy pescheor* in this romance, VI, 297, 319, relate to Gawain's visit to the Grail Castle, IV, 343 ff. (*Lancelot*, Part II), where we have a Maimed King who is neither named nor called *roi pescheor*. We have here, then, the customary confusion of the two characters.

Pelles' name occurs only once in the *Estoire del Saint Graal*, I, 290. He is there the descendant of the Maimed King, but he is not himself called either *roi mahaignie* or *roi pescheor*.

The branch in which we find Pelles' name most frequently, although his rôle is not so important here as in the *Lancelot*, Part III, or *Queste*, is the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation. In this branch he is always called Pelles de Listenois. See the examples given in note of the preceding page. In this text, II, 125, he guards his brother, Pellinor; p. 159, he is brother (cf., too, 221, 346, 359) to Alain, who is *riche roi pecheor*, and Pellinor, the *roi mahaignie*.[1] At p. 352, however, Eliezer, Pelles' son (cf. 388, 389), is called son of the *riche roy peschor*—so here Pelles is again the Fisher King as in the *Lancelot*, Part III, and *Queste*. We have, then, evidently in the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation a duplication of the Fisher King, owing to circumstances which I shall take up more fully in discussing Pellinor.

Leaving now the Vulgate cycle and turning to the *Merlin* continuation (*Livre d'Artus*) of MS 337, the author of this romance[2]

[1] The passage, II, 159, as reproduced from the British Museum MS Add. 10292 by Sommer in his edition is so corrupt as to be in part unintelligible. In *Modern Philology*, V, 305, however, he gives us the correct text from MS 747 of the Bibliothèque Nationale.

[2] In his article, "Zum Livre d' Artus," *Zs. f. romanische Philologie*, XVI, 90 ff., E. Freymond has shown that this romance presupposes all the romances of the Vulgate cycle and hence is of later date. E. Brugger, *Zs. f. frz. Spr. u. Litt.*, XXVIII, 57 f., insists, too, on its relative lateness. In his brochure, *The Structure of Le Livre d'Artus and its Function in the Evolution of the Arthurian Prose Romances* (London and Paris, 1914), Sommer argues that the *Livre d'Artus* of MS 337 is derived from a romance which is also the source of the Vulgate *Merlin* and which even antedates the *Lancelot*. The argument is largely based on differences between the Vulgate *Merlin* text printed by Sommer in his *Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances* on the one hand and the *Livre d' Artus* of MS 337 on the other, in passages that are obviously closely related. These differences, however, are mainly due to the fact that the author of the latter romance had a better MS of the Vulgate *Merlin* than the British Museum MS. Add. 10292 which

is virtually altogether dependent on the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation (especially II, 159) for the little that he says of him. The following are the passages concerned: VII, 15 (Pelles du roiaume de Listenois), 37 (Pelles), 146 (where he is one of the kings that sit at the Grail table), 243 (roi Pelles du chastel de Corbenic), 272 (roi Pelles du chastel de Corbenic deuers la Terre Foraine). In all these passages, except p. 146, he is barely named. I shall return to p. 146 in the discussion of Pellinor.

There is no need of giving the results of an examination of the individual passages in the prose *Tristan* relating to Pelles. They are all based on the *Queste* and *Lancelot*, Part III, and the author, of course, permits himself to embroider on the materials which he borrows. The most important alteration we find is p. 397 of Löseth's *Le Roman en prose de Tristan* (Paris, 1890)—in one of the later redactions, where Pelles is identified with the Maimed King and Galahad cures him with the bleeding lance.[1] Contrast with this, *Queste*, VI, 191, where Galahad cures the Maimed King with the lance, after Pelles, be it observed, has been required to leave the Grail Castle (p. 189).

The name of Pelles does not occur in the Didot *Perceval* nor in the *Merlin* continuation of the pesudo-Robert de Borron cycle[2] (best represented by the Huth *Merlin*), but in the *Queste* (represented by the Portuguese and Spanish *Demandas*) of this cycle we find him again in passages[3] that are based on the *Lancelot*, Part III, and the

Sommer has printed. The *Estoire del Saint Graal*, *Mort Artu* and latter part of the *Lancelot* are all frequently abbreviated in this MS series (MSS Add. 10292–10294), and, no doubt, the same is true of the *Merlin*. Moreover, Sommer demands such a close conformity between branches as the romance-writers never concerned themselves about. I discuss this *Livre d'Artus* before the *Perlesvaus*, etc., not because I suppose it of earlier date, but because it stands closest to the Vulgate cycle in its relationships.

[1] Compare also, Löseth, *Le roman en prose de Tristan*, pp. 278 ff. (Paris, 1890), for Pelles as the Maimed King.

[2] An additional fragment of the *Merlin* continuation of this cycle has been printed by Sommer in *Die Abenteuer Gawains, Ywains und Le Morholts mit den drei Jungfrauen* (Halle, 1913), from MS 112 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, but this has no importance for our inquiry, since only Pellinor, of the three characters with whom we are dealing, appears in it, and of him nothing distinctive is told. I will say, by way of anticipation, however, that the Pellias of this text (well-known through Malory and Tennyson) derived his name, no doubt, from our Pellean(s), the stroke (=*n*) over the *a* being omitted.

[3] Spanish *Demanda*, pp. 238 ff., 280 ff., 305 ff., in the edition of A. Bonilla y San Martin (Madrid, 1907), Nueva Biblioteca de Autores Españoles. The last of these passages (which is not in the Portuguese; see Sommer, *Romania*, XXXVI, 584), is based directly on the *Queste*, VI, 189 ff. In the others we have Pelles as the father of Galahad's mother and lord of the Adventurous Palace (Grail Castle), but the author has attached to these conceptions new inventions of his own.

Queste. He is not called here, however, either Fisher King or Maimed King.

Lastly, in the *Perlesvaus*, in which romance Perceval, of course, is again the Grail Knight, instead of Pelles' grandson Galahad, Pelles plays a subordinate part as the Hermit King and one of Perceval's three maternal uncles. The Fisher King and the wicked King of the Chastel Mortel were his brothers. The author of this romance returns to Chrétien's conception and makes the Fisher King also the Maimed King. Now, in Chrétien, ll. 6376 ff., the father of the Fisher King had a brother who was a hermit. The author of the *Perlesvaus* shifts this brother from the father, who was also maimed, to the son, and identifies him with King Pelles—hence we have in his romance, Pelles, the Hermit King. He next took Alain as the name of the father of his hero. It had been the name of the second Grail Keeper in Robert's *Joseph* and he retained very naturally as the name of the father of his Grail Knight a name that had been hallowed by earlier Grail associations.

It is useless to speculate on hypothetical lost sources as responsible for this new distribution of the Grail rôles. No writer of Arthurian romance felt himself bound by his predecessors—least of all, the author of the *Perlesvaus*, who did not hesitate to set aside the best established of all Arthurian traditions, viz., that Guinevere's adultery brought about the destruction of Arthur and his knights.[1]

J. Douglas Bruce

University of Tennessee

[*To be continued*]

[1] For fuller observations on this subject, cf. my article, "The Development of the Mort Arthur Theme in Mediaeval Romance," *Romanic Review*, IV, 450, note 66.

DON GARCIE AND *LE MISANTHROPE*

The personal element in Molière's works has been the object of so much investigation that a new article on the subject seems presumptuous, especially considering the array of critics who would be summoned as witnesses if the anonymous author of *La Fameuse Comédienne* could ever be haled into court to answer for libel upon Molière's wife, and should undertake to substantiate his (or her) charges by proving that they were based upon information furnished by the poet himself in his various plays.

The majority of the commentators are convinced of the truth of the statement of his early biographers, that: "Il s'est joué le premier en plusieurs endroits sur des affaires de sa famille et qui regardaient ce qui se passait dans sa domestique. C'est ce que ses plus particuliers amis ont remarqué bien des fois."[1] And, indeed, the writer of those lines should have known whereof he spoke, for it was none other than La Grange, leading actor and recorder of the troupe for so many years, evidently a man in intimate contact with Molière and enjoying his confidence and esteem.

With this as their charter, many have labored with indefatigable zeal to show the intimate connection between the incidents of the poet's own family life and the plays written at the corresponding period, particularly as they express the resultant mood of the author and his attitude toward his wife, and it must be admitted that they have collected a formidable mass of evidence. To them *Le Misanthrope* is hardly more than a thinly veiled picture of Molière's own jealousy, and Célimène a direct presentation of his wife in her own person.

To other admirers of the poet, this whole attitude is obnoxious. They, like Elise of *La Critique de l'Ecole des Femmes*, "regardent les choses du côté qu'on les leur montre, et ne les tournent point pour y chercher ce qu'il ne faut pas voir." They feel that it would have been a base act, unworthy of their favorite, to bring himself and his

[1] Quoted from Rigal, *Molière*, I, 12. See also A. Lefranc, *Revue des cours et des conférences*, XVI, 105.

private life and, worse still, his wife before the public gaze, and they resolutely close their eyes to all the similarities which one can offer them, and find no excuse in the disguise which the author has been careful to provide.

A third class believes that it was entirely natural for Molière, the great observer, to study himself and his family, just as he studied others, but that it is impossible for us to distinguish the real from the invented, or facts taken from his own experience from those gained by observation, since even his contemporaries differed in their identification of originals, and since we know from such characters as Trissotin, of *Les Femmes Savantes*, that the poet deliberately made over his models.

A few quotations will illustrate the differences of opinion regarding this point in general, and *Le Misanthrope* in particular:

> The poems of Molière show us not only in uninterrupted succession the continual progress and development of the writer, they are also an exact mirror of the mental state of the man at the time of their production. In the works of no other author is the connection between the creator and his works so unmistakable as in the comedies of Molière. [Paul Lindau, *Molière, Eine Ergänzung der Biographie des Dichters aus seinen Werken* (1877), p. 3.]
>
> For Molière to choose a lovers' quarrel so nearly resembling his own, a hero so like himself in many essentials, and a heroine who might readily pass as a portrait of his wife, and then fail to express his own wounded feelings in the lines spoken by Alceste, would be impossible if he be granted a heart. [Chatfield-Taylor, *Molière*, p. 277.]
>
> That he put something of himself into the protesting Alceste is likely enough, just as he certainly put something of himself into Philinte, the Epicurean temporizer, content to move through life along the line of least resistance. Every artist must paint himself; and he knows others and is able to project them into independent life only because he knows himself. . . . . Nothing in Molière's career leads us to suppose that he would lay bare his own life on the stage and invite the sympathy of the public for his private misfortunes. Indeed, we have every reason to believe that this is what he would never dream of doing, since it would be an act absolutely abhorrent to a man of his temperament. Self-revelation of this kind belongs to the lyric, not to the drama; and Molière had little in common with Shelley. Rather is he like Lucretius, who kept out of his lofty and austere poem every fact of his own biography. [Brander Matthews, *Molière*, pp. 110, 218, 220.]

Despois and Mesnard take a similar view regarding the impossibility of identification of the author either with Alceste or Philinte,

and insist that he was pre-eminently a painter, giving us a faithful picture of the society of the time. They admit the possibility of others finding a personal explanation for the picture here presented, though they refuse to accept the testimony of the famous libel, *La Fameuse Comédienne*, of doubtful authenticity. "En 1664, dit M. Aimé-Martin, époque à laquelle Molière travaillait au *Misanthrope*, il se sépara de sa femme, comme Alceste de Célimène, après lui avoir offert son pardon. Prenons garde toutefois que quelques vers très passionnés du rôle d'Alceste, où l'expression de sa jalousie est si pénétrante, se trouvaient déjà, comme nous l'avons rappelé plus haut, dans une pièce représentée en février 1661, un an avant le mariage de Molière, ajoutons composée depuis longtemps."

This warning is qualified by the admission that many of these fine verses are not in *Don Garcie* and that Alceste is unhappy in a different way from Don Garcie and suffers from a coquetry which is only too real. They continue: "Pourquoi donc ne pas admettre que le poète a été inspiré par ses propres chagrins? La conjecture, en effet, n'est pas à répousser, si l'on n'y dépasse pas la juste mesure."[1]

Rigal is more positive as to the importance to be attached to the lines occurring in *Don Garcie:*

> En somme, de tant de suppositions échafaudées sur la carrière théâtrale d'Armande, il ne reste guère debout que celle qui concerne les rôles d'Alceste et de Célimène dans *Le Misanthrope*, et celle-ci même, hélas! est d'une solidité fort douteuse. Parmi les vers les plus caractéristiques de l'atrabilaire amoureux et de la coquette, beaucoup, en 1666, ont été repris par Molière dans son *Don Garcie de Navarre* de 1661, antérieur de plus d'un an à son mariage. Vous avez cru tout à l'heure que je citais quatre vers du *Misanthrope;* j'ai cité quatre vers de *Don Garcie.*[2]

Other quotations might be given, principally from those who find close agreement between the facts of the author's life and the incidents, characterization, and meaning of his plays. They would, so it seems to me, at least, prove that this relation does exist, and that it is not merely a pleasant, though futile, exercise of wit to seek it out; rather that it throws new light on many points.[3]

[1] Despois and Mesnard, *Grands Ecrivains* edition of Molière, V, 385–86.

[2] Rigal, *Molière*, I, 26.

[3] Among the noteworthy studies of this kind, in addition to the works already quoted, are those of Schneegans, *Molière* (Berlin, 1902), which offers invaluable information and comment on all the plays, and to which is to be added his previous article on *Molières Subjektivismus, Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Literaturgeschichte*, XV, 407; and his reply to criticism, in *Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie*, XXVII, 275 ff.; the

It would seem, for instance, that the relation between the two plays of *Le Misanthrope* and *Don Garcie* had not been sufficiently studied, since Rigal's argument, above quoted, is advanced long after Despois and Mesnard had admitted that many of the fine verses of *Le Misanthrope* are not to be found in the previous play, and that Alceste, who suffers from a coquetry that is only too real, is unhappy in a different way from Don Garcie.[1]

The purpose of this paper, then, has been to compare the plays more closely, to study the lines which are identical, and to see what bearing they have on the play of *Le Misanthrope* as a whole. Inasmuch as there appeared to be a decided change in the author's attitude in at least one aspect, it became of importance to examine the intervening plays for any evidence as to the time of this change, and to see whether or not a gradual development could be noted.

It will hardly fall within the bounds of this study, therefore, to take up the arguments advanced by the dissenters to the theory that Molière should have put himself, and his wife, and his own deep emotions into his plays. For him the dramatic form was the medium of self-expression, just as for another it is the lyric. Even a critic, in his interpretations, must be influenced to some extent by his personal experience and by the analysis of his own sentiments, and put these into his studies.[2] It is well known that Molière did not hesitate to allude to himself, his own peculiarities and those of his comrades, in some plays; this was a recognized procedure in the old farces which were the foundation of his dramatic system;[3] why should he not have taken the characters and incidents which were about him as the material with which to work? The material thus obtained he disguised, combining real traits from one person with those from

reviews by Ph. Aug. Becker, in *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Literaturgeschichte*, XVI, 194–221, and Vossler, *Archiv für das Studium der neu. Spr. u. Lit.*, CVIII, 461, in which they protest against the emphasis on the subjective element in Molière, as does Rigal in the introduction to his volume already referred to. The prefaces to the various plays in the *Grands Ecrivains* edition should be consulted in each case. Of prime importance, also, are the *compte-rendus* of the course of Professor Abel Lefranc, given at the Collège de France, published in *La Revue des cours et des conférences* (Paris, 1906–10), especially XIV, 19 ff., and XVI, 104 ff.' 161 ff. J. Loiseleur, *Les Points obscurs de la vie de Molière* (Paris, 1877), is one of the well-known exponents of the subjective point of view.

[1] One should compare, however, the statement in the introduction to the consideration of *Le Misanthrope* (Rigal, *Molière*, II, 45): "Il est natural qu'elle se ressentit des dispositions de Molière à cette date, d'autant que Célimène, la coquette qui, dans la comédie, faisait souffrir Alceste, devait être jouée par Armande, et que le jaloux grondeur, Alceste, devait être joué par Molière lui-même."

[2] Anatole France, *La Vie littéraire*, I, préface, p. iv.

[3] Lanson, "Molière et la Farce," *Revue de Paris*, VIII, 3, *p.* 129.

another, and with some which he found in books or invented. No one was exempt, yet he might always deny complete identity. And we will assume that in *Le Misanthrope*, as in other plays, he might have introduced, either consciously or without deliberate intention, some elements of his own recent experiences with society, particularly with the passions of love and jealousy.

What, then, is to be done with the portion of the play taken from *Don Garcie?* Did the author take over lines which he felt were particularly well turned, and make a place for them in *Le Misanthrope*, in order that they might not be lost in a play which had proved an utter failure? Shall we not rather say that he was merely following his well-known custom of taking his "bien" where he found it?[1] In some cases the wording has been changed a little, a thing any author would do in revising, and in most, if not all, these verbal differences one discerns an improvement.

Does it follow, then, from the use of this material, amounting to some one hundred and fifteen lines, taken almost verbatim from several passages in the earlier comedy to make up half the verses in two scenes (IV, 2 and 3) of *Le Misanthrope*,[2] that, if the true sentiments of the poet have been expressed in one of the plays, the same must be true of the other, and that, if the former cannot be a reflection of Molière's actual feelings toward Armande, since it was written before his marriage, then the second passage cannot be, either? Such a conclusion would be unfounded. For one thing, the passion of jealousy was a favorite one with the poet. Professor Lefranc has very clearly shown how it permeates all his plays,[3] and this is natural, since it was a popular theme among the old writers of farces and fabliaux. Moreover, Molière may well have experienced it at the time of the writing of *Don Garcie*. It would have been the same passion whether felt for Armande or another, and our playwright was not above suspicion as regards intrigues with the actresses of his troupe. This supposition, however, is unnecessary, and the jealousy

[1] Despois and Mesnard in a note to *Don Garcie* (II, 300, note) quote the four lines from Bélisaire introduced there by the poet, and remark: "ces réminiscences assez insignifiantes d'ailleurs, devaient être toutes naturelles et presque toujours involontaires chez un comédien dont le mémoire était remplie de souvenirs de ce genre." May not this explanation be applicable also to the lines, more numerous, it is true, which Molière has taken from his own previous play to use in *Le Misanthrope?*

[2] *Grands Ecrivains*, V, 518–28; II, *Don Garcie, passim.*

[3] *Revue des cours et des conférences*, XVI, 97.

of the play which was first produced in 1661, though the lines were written before, according to the statement of Somaize,[1] may really refer to the author's sentiments toward Armande at that time. It was in 1661 that he obtained the grant of an additional share in the profits of his company, for himself, or for his wife if he should marry. The investigations of Professor Lefranc would show that his interest in Armande can be traced back as early as 1659, if she is the one referred to in the letter of Chapelle, which some deny.[2] Is it not natural to suppose, with our knowledge of Armande's character as it was later disclosed, that, even at this time, her lover may have felt the pangs of jealousy?

The general tone of the first play is in accord with this hypothesis. It is decidedly more romantic. Our dramatist is making an excursion into the field of heroic comedy, and deals with Spanish princes and infantas, who speak in a *précieux* style, and have Cornelian ideas of duty and honor. This characteristic is in marked contrast with the play of *Sganarelle*, or *Le Cocu imaginaire*, which preceded *Don Garcie*, the theme of which is jealousy, but in low station. It is noteworthy that here, as in *Don Garcie*, we have jealousy based upon unfounded suspicions due to deceptive appearances.

In the heroic comedy the action turns upon a series of passionate outbursts on the part of the suspicious Prince of Navarre. He thinks continually he has cause to suspect the fidelity of his lady love, Doña Elvire, who is really most devoted to him and resents, with all the violence of outraged innocence, the insult of his doubting her after she has condescended to let him see that she cares for him. Appearances are always against the lady; first, it is the torn half of a letter, really intended for Don Garcie, but supposed by him to have been addressed to a rival, which occasions his reproaches; next, the sudden discovery of this rival with Doña Elvire; then, a glimpse of the latter in the arms of a man—who turns out to be a distressed damsel in disguise. The spectator has been shown each time the occasion for the suspicions of the lover, and sees that they are not unnatural, but he knows at the same time that the sweetheart is innocent. The play ends with a marriage, the lady yielding to the conviction that

[1] Quoted in Introduction, *Grands Ecrivains*, II, 220–21.

[2] *Revue des cours et des conférences*, XVI, 161.

her lover is suffering from a malady which it is not in his power to overcome, and is therefore not to be blamed.

Surely, if Molière were wooing Armande at this period, the idea presented was well calculated to excuse him for any jealous suspicions he might have shown, and win her consent to follow the example of the heroine and forgive. Throughout the play the man is admittedly wrong, and on the defensive, while the woman, we are made to see, may be innocent, no matter how strong the circumstantial evidence against her.

The tone is entirely different in *Le Misanthrope.* Here, it is the woman who is on the defensive. She uses exactly the same arguments as Elvira—namely, the indignation of offended innocence; insistence that any doubt on the part of her lover, after her intimation that she loves him, is an insult; the declaration that she repudiates all she has ever said or done to encourage him—yet, in spite of these pleas, she is proved guilty of falsehood and insincerity. May not the poet's choice of identical arguments be significant? We may sympathize to some extent with Célimène's resentment at the irritable, overbearing manner of her lover, but we also sympathize with him. His love is sincere, and we see that he is right in distrusting her. His is a fault of manner, hers a vice of character.

Even the context in which the identical passages are placed, and the verbal changes in the verses themselves, lend a note of greater sincerity to the rather artificial speeches of the hero. I should be tempted to distrust my own judgment as to this, but a note of Despois and Mesnard, who set down all resemblances and identical passages in the two plays with scrupulous accuracy, bears me out.[1]

[1] Note to line 573 of *Don Garcie.* I cite first the passage to which the note refers for purposes of comparison:

Don Garcie:
Encore est-ce beaucoup que, de franchise pure,
Vous demeuriez d'accord que c'est votre écriture.
Mais ce sera, sans doute, et j'en serois garant,
Un billet qu'on envoie à quelque indifférent;
Ou du moins, ce qu'il a de tendresse évidente,
Sera pour une amie, ou pour quelque parente.

Doña Elvire:
Non, c'est pour un amant que ma main l'a formé,
Et j'ajoute de plus, pour un amant aimé.

Note: Ce qui est ici une ironie amère devient dans *Le Misanthrope* un mouvement de sensibilité touchante:

"De grace, montrez-moi, je serai satisfait,
Qu'on peut pour une femme expliquer ce billet."

Et Célimène répond avec le même sentiment de fierté blessé, mais avec beaucoup moins de sincérité qu'Elvire:

"Non, il est pour Oronte et je veux qu'on le croie."

Of course this increased naturalness is due in part to the fact that the master's dramatic technique has improved in the meantime, and due weight must be given this point. I need not dwell on the many superiorities of *Le Misanthrope* over *Don Garcie:* the advantage gained by showing Alceste in contact with the world, and presenting other phases of his character; the heightening of the impression by the introduction of contrasting characters, such as Philinte, and Eliante, and Arsinoé. Because of them, Alceste's blunt and dictatorial manner is brought into greater relief, and Célimène also appears in clearer light, for she is more sympathetic than the mischief-making and scandal-seeking prude who criticizes her, and less admirable, by far, than her more reasonable, but less dashing and popular cousin, emphasizing thus the poet's doctrine, that "la raison n'est pas ce qui règle l'amour."

To elaborate this theme would tend to obscure the other question I have in mind, whether the intervening plays, which show the author's growing aesthetic power, offer also any indication of a change in his attitude toward life which would explain this deeper personal note and keener understanding of the passion he depicts. To my mind, there is ample justification for the conclusions of the many critics who find clear evidence of continual allusions to the dramatist's emotional experiences at this eventful time.[1] But it does not seem to me that direct reference to events of the poet's real life must be established for all of his productions in order to maintain the validity of my argument.

It will be sufficient to summarize briefly my conclusions with regard to each play, without attempting to burden the discussion with long quotations, inasmuch as the force of the argument lies in the general point of view of the author, in each play, rather than in detached scenes and speeches. Moreover, it hardly appears necessary to take up the plays which precede *Don Garcie*, unless perhaps it be *Les Précieuses ridicules*, since, in *L'Etourdi* and in *Le Dépit amoureux*, Molière was following very closely the tradition of the Italian comedy of intrigue. There is a vividness and a naturalness

[1] Compare the works already cited, especially Schneegans, Rigal, Chatfield-Taylor, and Lefranc. The latter says (*Revue des cours et des conférences*, XVI, 105): "Ainsi le rapport entre les sentiments du poète et ses pièces est incontestable; jamais d'ailleurs, line fut aussi saisissant que dans les années qui nous occupent en ce moment (1660–64)."

about the episode of the lover's tiff which bespeak keen observation but not necessarily personal experience, and I see no definite connection with the specific point under discussion. In the *Précieuses*, Molière has utilized the procedure of the old farce in retaining the names of his actors for his personnages.[1] Is it possible to add that he may have been satirizing the efforts of his two leading ladies, newly returned from the provinces, to ape the fine manners of Paris society? This would be tempting, but only a conjecture. The most we can say is that it indicates a willingness on the part of the poet to make use of his immediate company and surroundings to furnish realistic detail, a means which he continued to employ.

In *L'Ecole des Maris*, 1661, which followed *Don Garcie* after only a few months' interval, and preceded the marriage of Molière by a short time, there appears to be a direct plea to Armande, in the favorable presentation of the young ward, who formed an attachment for her old guardian, because of his kind treatment and his sympathetic understanding of a young girl's interests and her natural fondness for dress and society. Similarly, our sympathy is won for her sister, who deceived her exacting, ill-tempered guardian, whose faith was only in bolts and bars and severe repression, and ran off with a young lover. One would say that this implies, on Molière's part, a recognition of the kind of treatment which his bride would have a right to expect, and also his intention to act the generous guardian and not make himself ridiculous.

Les Fâcheux, which is next in order, offers no more than a passing allusion to jealousy; there is, perhaps, a trace of the poet's own vexation with the bores who interfered with his courtship.[2]

L'Ecole des Femmes has occasioned almost as much controversy as *Le Misanthrope* over the matter of the author's self-revelation. Note that in this play again we sympathize with the girl, and that the brusk, overbearing, jealous man is made ridiculous, though, here and there, one seems to catch a note of underlying sympathy with his

[1] See Lanson, "Molière et la Farce," *Revue de Paris*, VIII, 3, p. 129.

[2] Cf. N. M. Bernardin, *Les Chefs du Chœur* (Paris, 1914), p. 110: "Et elle m'intéresse encore, cette jolie scène (Acte II, les deux fâcheuses), parceque Molière, le jaloux Molière, qui a écrit *Don Garcie de Navarre* et qui écrira *Le Misanthrope*, y addresse, pardessus la tête des deux marquises, à la jeune fille, qui dans quelques mois sera sa femme, cet hémistiche plein de passion; 'Le jaloux aime plus.'"

sufferings. It may mark the preoccupation of the author regarding his fate as husband, as most critics appear to admit; but, to my mind, the tone of the play is not that of the disappointed, jealous husband, but, rather, one of security and jesting, as though Molière were forestalling taunting allusions to the inequality in age by being the first to heap ridicule upon the old fellow who either believes that he can win the affection of a young girl against her will, or trusts to ignorance or force to guarantee a woman's virtue. Arnolphe, in his passionate outbursts, may betray the capacity of emotion of his creator, but the figure lacks the bitterness of later plays. Arnolphe is a more ridiculous figure than Alceste, and, as I have said, we justify Agnes in her action, and so does Molière in this play, as he did the similar situation in *L'Ecole des Maris*. We may say that Molière feels that his wife is not the "sotte" Agnes, and he does not intend to be the domineering, exacting Sganarelle, nor Arnolphe, though he might be somewhat impatient at times.[1]

The little play of *La Critique de l'Ecole des Femmes* offers us Molière's wife in the rôle of a young woman of society, clever and sarcastic, whose tone reminds one decidedly of Célimène in the scene with the prude.

The same year, in *L'Impromptu de Versailles* (III, 392) we see Armande intrusted again with a similar rôle by her husband-director, and actually brought on the stage in her own name, in company with the other actors, in dress rehearsal. There, too, we have the famous tiff between her and Molière which merits citation here. Armande has interrupted the rehearsal, and Molière says:

"Taisez-vous, ma femme, vous êtes une bête."

Mlle de Molière: "Grand merci, monsieur mon mari. Voilà ce que c'est! Le mariage change bien les gens, et vous ne m'auriez pas dit cela il y a dix-huit mois."

[1] Cf. Bernardin, *Les Chefs du Chœur*, p. 143: "Non, Molière n'a pas voulu faire plaindre Arnolphe, ce qui irait contre la thèse qu'il soutient; seulement il était lui-même porté à la jalousie; il en avait souffert; il se rappelait des heures cruelles encore au souvenir. Il a donc mis quelquechose de son propre cœur dans la douleur de son personnage; une goutte du sang de Molière est tombée dans l'encre avec laquelle il a écrit cette scène si profondément humaine, mais elle n'en est pas moins, dans son ensemble, une pure scène de comédie." Cf. Schneegans, *op. cit.*, pp. 89, 93; Chatfield-Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 163–65 (as usual, the latter finds more direct allusion to the author); Rigal, *op. cit.*, I, 157–83, gives a reasonable explanation, without this subjective element. See also Lefranc, *op. cit.*

Molière: "Taisez-vous, je vous prie."

Mlle de Molière: "C'est une chose étrange qu'une petite cérémonie soit capable de nous ôter toutes nos belles qualités, et qu'un mari et un galant regardent la même personne avec des yeux si différents."

Molière: "Que de discours!"

Mlle de Molière: "Ma foi, si je faisais une comédie, je la ferais sur ce sujet. Je justifierais les femmes de bien des choses dont on les accuse; et je ferais craindre aux maris la différence qu'il y a de leurs manières brusques, aux civilités des galants."

Note that the lines indicate in Armande a type of character very similar to that of Célimène, fully capable of bringing home to her husband her disapproval of the change in his manner since the days when he was a lover. In Molière, a sharpness and impatience is shown which resembles that of Alceste.

In *Le Mariage Forcé* (scene ii) there is a cynical attitude toward the coming relations between the elderly husband, who is made ridiculous, and the notorious young flirt, who gives him plainly to understand that she sees in marriage an opportunity of gratifying her fondness for "gambling, visiting, assemblies, entertainments, promenades, in fact all kinds of pleasures," and that she knows he will not be so foolish as to be jealous. The note in this play is very bitter, and its date, just before the first three acts of *Tartuffe*, in 1664, corresponds with the period at which, according to Brossette, the dramatist was at work on the first act of *Le Misanthrope*.

The *Princesse d'Elide*, which immediately precedes *Tartuffe*, offers no apparent relation to contemporary incident or to Armande.

In the *Tartuffe*, Elmire appears as one of Molière's most estimable female characters. How can this be reconciled with our theory? In the first place, we do not contend, as I have said before, that allusions to Armande are to be found in all of the plays. The poet may have desired to show that he realized that the other type of woman existed, as he does in Eliante of *Le Misanthrope*. But there are certain points deserving of attention on the other side. Elmira is called a coquette by some commentators, and, though I do not agree with them (it would be better for my argument if I did), she is evidently fond of dress and society, and justifies to some extent their accusation. Grimarest reports a rebuke administered to Armande by her husband because of her elaborate costumes in this

play. Furthermore, may not Elmire's speech, which sets forth the inadvisability of troubling a husband with any of the silly actions of a lover,[1] present Armande's own views, and the whole episode indicate a willingness on the part of the author to accept his wife's explanations, to reject slander and to admit again her possible innocence, just as Alceste offers to accept Célimène's explanation of the letter?

It was just after this period that Armande's indiscretions were most talked about, and her name coupled with those of various young nobles. Did this have anything to do with choice of the playwright's next theme, *Don Juan*, the seducer? Possibly not; this choice may be perfectly well explained on other grounds, but it is at least suggestive. The play contains, you will recall, another of Molière's sympathetic women characters, perhaps the most idealistic of them all, Doña Elvire. Probably it was not her rôle which was played by Molière's wife, but that of Charlotte, the peasant girl, who is willing to desert her humble lover for the bold betrayer.

L'Amour Médecin also intervenes before the completed *Misanthrope*, which was not presented until 1666, although it may have been begun in 1664. This little comedy-ballet, satirizing the court physicians, affords us no new arguments. We sympathize with the girl, who deceives her father in order to wed the man of her choice, but it is her father's gullibility in matters of medicine which is most stressed, together with the charlatanry of the doctors of that day.

This brings us to *Le Misanthrope*, in which, as in the preceding plays, the reproachful, intemperate, jealous lover, is made ridiculous. But in Alceste the ridicule is on the surface; one cannot fail to recognize the noble qualities and suffering heart beneath. Less attention was paid by the author before to developing this feature, though glimpses of a tragic undercurrent are to be caught in Arnolphe of *L'Ecole des Femmes*, and in the bitter deception of the weak and burlesque Sganarelle of *Le Mariage Forcé;* and there is a brief, but

[1] *Le Tartuffe*, acte II, scène 5:

"Oui, je tiens que jamais de tous ces vains propos,
On ne doit d'un mari traverser le repos,
Que ce n'est point de là que l'honneur peut dépendre,
Et qu'il suffit pour nous de savoir nous défendre:
Ce sont mes sentiments; et vous n'auriez rien dit,
Damis, si j'avois eu sur vous quelque crédit."

vigorous, manly protest against his calumniators, voiced by the poet speaking in his own name, in *L'Impromptu de Versailles*.

The spectator's sympathy has heretofore been drawn to the heroine in her contest with her uncompromising or distrustful lover or guardian in almost every case except in *Le Misanthrope* (save in *Le Mariage Forcé*, where her rôle is but a small one). Some resemblance to Célimène is to be found in the sarcastic marquise of the *Critique de l'Ecole des Femmes*, in Armande's own part in *L'Impromptu de Versailles*, and, possibly, in Elmire of *Tartuffe*, and in Dorimène of *Le Mariage Forcé*. On the whole, the tone is more or less sympathetic with the fondness of the girl for dress, society, and diversions, until *Le Misanthrope*. May this not mean that here, also, we are to sympathize with Célimène against Alceste, in the superficial things, while we condemn her heart? May it not mean, furthermore, that the poet, after sympathizing with Armande and trying to justify her, saw, at last, her insincerity and fickleness, and allowed his resentment to appear in this form?

Sufficient probability has been established, or so it seems to me, for us to conclude that the lines taken over from *Don Garcie* to make one of the episodes of *Le Misanthrope* not only do not prove that the jealousy of Alceste is not that of the poet, since he might have experienced the passion even at the time of *Don Garcie*, but, on the other hand, they suggest more forcibly the change in domestic conditions, inasmuch as in this play the suspicions of the lover are justified. This change of viewpoint seems to be contemporaneous with the poet's marital infelicity, and would plainly seem to be an outcome of it. Hints of it, and allusions to characteristics of Armande, which are similar to those of Célimène, appear in some of the comedies before *Le Misanthrope*, and make it more probable that she was really in the poet's mind as he wrote.

Is this too subjective? Or may one say that it is not all mere assumption, and that Rigal, in the passage previously quoted, and Brander Matthews in the lines given below,[1] attach too much

[1] Brander Matthews, *Molière*, p. 219: "One reason why so many of his critics and commentators have insisted upon identifying him more often with Alceste than with any other of his creatures is their belief that the relations of Molière to his wife at the time when this comedy was composed are reflected in the play. Their contention is that they overhear an echo of Molière's appeal to Armande Béjart, in the reproaches Alceste (which he acted) addresses to Célimène (which she acted). But this is sheer assumption,

importance to the verses which were taken from *Don Garcie*, and try to diminish too severely Molière's tendency to self-revelation ?[1]

This self-revelation, under the disguise in which it appears, need have nothing abhorrent or displeasing. Its effect, it seems to me, should be to make *Le Misanthrope* more profound, more significant, because of its background of real emotional experience. To be complete, a similar study should be made of the plays from *Le Misanthrope* to *Le Malade Imaginaire*. I hope shortly to publish the results of an investigation which appears to confirm the theory that the changes in the author's home life found their echo also in these plays.

CASIMIR DOUGLASS ZDANOWICZ

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

unsupported by the facts; and it is significant that certain of the speeches in which Alceste voices his despairing jealousy and which sound as if they had been wrung from Molière's own heart at this moment of anguish when he and his wife were living apart, were not written originally for the *Misanthrope* but for *Don Garcie*, produced long before his marriage. This unsuccessful play had never been published, and its author held himself at liberty to use its fragments again not only in the *Misanthrope* but in others of his later plays."

[1] The claim of Boileau that Molière admitted that Alceste was modeled after him in some particulars, and the story of a similar identification with Montausier, do not preclude the interpretation here suggested. It was Molière's custom, when he took characters from real life, to disguise them, to combine in one person qualities or traits taken from several, thereby throwing off the track those who were continually seeking to identify the originals, and preserving an alibi for himself, and, at the same time, offering more complete patterns, or types, of the vice he was satirizing, or presenting such inconsistencies as made the personage more human. One may even think of him as setting himself the problem of indicating how a Boileau or a Montausier would feel and act in situations analagous to those in which he found himself, or how Armande would have acted in certain conditions. But this is going far afield into the realms of subjective revery, from which it has been the endeavor to keep the argument free.

THE FINANCIAL DIFFICULTIES OF LAMARTINE

The object of this article is to gather together scattered data in regard to the financial record of Lamartine, and to use these facts as a basis for a brief discussion of the causes which led up to the unfortunate financial condition of the poet in his old age. The following unpublished letter, in the handwriting of Mlle Valentine de Cessia de Lamartine, the niece of the poet, may serve as a starting-point for this discussion. This letter was written when Lamartine was seventy-four years of age, and is typical of the other letters of this period.

PARIS, 5 décembre, 1864

M. de Lamartine, dépouillé cette année par la partialité de l'Angleterre, de la fortune de sa femme, qui devait l'aider à désintéresser ses créanciers, est obligé plus que jamais de recourir aux deux honorables ressources qui ne lui ont jamais manqué: son travail et votre amitié.

Il vous prie en conséquence de lui renvoyer le plus promptement possible, le mandat d'abonnement ci joint signé de vous.

ALPH. DE LAMARTINE

43, RUE DE LA VILLE L'ÉVÊQUE[1]

The finances of Lamartine were in a deplorable condition at the time the above letter was written; a condition which was not the result of a few years of misfortune but was the culmination of years of ill-regulated expenditure. It is necessary, in order to have a clear understanding of the situation in which we find Lamartine at this advanced age, to study the entire history of his finances, a study which can be best made through his correspondence. The most of the important letters from 1807 to 1852 are of easy access in the collection published by his niece, Mlle Valentine de Cessia, under the title, *Correspondance de Lamartine*;[2] but those letters which deal

[1] The above letter was attached to the back of the title-page of an edition of the *Œuvres complètes* of Lamartine, purchased by the University of Illinois Library in 1915. The first volume of this edition contains the autograph of the author—*Mémoire et reconnaissance, Lamartine*—written on the fly-leaf. No evidence of the previous publication of this letter has been found in the individual letters or in the various collections of letters that have been consulted.

[2] *Correspondance de Lamartine*, publiée par Mme Valentine de Lamartine, 4 vols., Paris, 1881–82 (second edition).

with the last seventeen years of the poet's life are less easily available, as they are scattered in different collections.

Three words from the foregoing letter—*désintéresser ses créanciers*—might well serve as a key to the financial record of his life, since at no time does Lamartine seem to be completely free from debt. As a youth, he received frequent aid from the private purse of his mother, and as a young man of twenty-nine we find him complaining in a letter to a youthful friend, Mlle Eléonore de Canonge, of his harassing debts, a complaint which he terminates with the prophetic statement so applicable to his later life: "Quand on a mis, en commençant sa route, le pied dans cette maudite boue, on ne s'en retire jamais totalement."[1] He was relieved of the debts in question through the indulgence of an uncle and two aunts—*à l'insu même de mon père*, he adds.

The gifts made him by his father, and his uncles and aunts, at the time of his marriage in 1820, together with the available portion of the dowry of his bride,[2] furnished him with a comfortable income, which, however, was insufficient to meet his expenditures, especially during his diplomatic career in Italy. The famous Oriental trip in 1832–33, which lasted sixteen months, was the cause of an additional burden on his budget. The expensive nature of this undertaking may be judged from the fact that he chartered for this voyage an entire boat at a rate of approximately three thousand francs a month. It must be confessed that this expense weighed but lightly upon him, for in writing to his friend the comte de Virieu, he ends the description of this transaction with the nonchalant statement: "C'est prodigieusement peu pour un beau navire."[3] Three months later it is a caravan of sixty to one hundred men, with the necessary complement of horses, mules, etc., which he acquires for his service, again with the modest statement: "Cet immense attirail de choses . . . n'est pas énormément cher."[4] The other expenses of the trip are in proportion. It is only just to state, on the other hand, that

[1] Letter of October 8, 1819, *Correspondance*, II, 77.

[2] See article of M. René Doumic (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, September–October, 1905, p. 171).

[3] Letter of June 25, 1832, *Correspondance*, III, 281.

[4] Letter of September 6, 1832, *Correspondance*, III, 292.

the cost of this trip was made up, three years later, by the publication and sale of the *Voyage en Orient.*

The strain imposed upon his finances by this voyage was increased by a succession of financial misfortunes which caused him to write, three years later: "J'ai perdu tous mes capitaux disponibles dans des banqueroutes, des entreprises mal exécutées, en Amérique, et dans une grêle qui vient de ravager *entièrement* mes propriétés où j'avais mis des avances énormes; je dois beaucoup et je ne puis vendre."[1] The same state of affairs exists in 1841, for we find him seeking, in that year, a loan of 200,000 francs on two of his estates valued at 1,400,000 francs, and which are already mortgaged for 465,000 francs.[2]

The reasons for this indebtedness, as well as that of later years, are not difficult to discover. In the first place, Lamartine, with the exception of his last few years, always lived the life of a rich nobleman, surrounding himself with beautiful things: horses, dogs, books, works of art. "Les chevaux ! autre bénédiction de la vie, qui me soulage un peu. J'en ai de charmants et en bon nombre," he writes to a friend in 1837, in the same letter in which he acknowledges: "J'ai cinq ou six ans très-étroits à traverser, plus d'argent et des charges viagères énormes!"[3] The expenses of this luxurious life could have been met by the income from his books, if he had been willing to devote himself to literature alone. Unfortunately, the desire for a more active life carried him into other fields, in which he was less successful. In business affairs he was possessed with an innate fondness for taking chances, although he writes emphatically a propos of his real estate transactions in Asia: "Je ne fais pas de spéculations, je les ai en horreur."[4] One form of speculation in which he indulged was that of purchasing the growing crops of neighboring vine-growers, in order to use them as security for loans, transactions in which he lost large sums by the depreciation in price of the crops or their destruction by storms or plant diseases. A good description of one of these dealings is given in his *Mémoires politiques,*

[1] *Correspondance,* III, 367.

[2] *Ibid.,* IV, 104.

[3] Letter of September 29, 1837, *Correspondance,* III, 433.

[4] Letter of April 14, 1850, *Correspondance,* IV, 312.

when in 1849 the vine-growers of his neighborhood offered him their crops on credit to help him meet his debts. He says: "J'acceptai avec attendrissement. Je fixai moi-même le prix de ces vins largement aussi; je les revendis à perte aux marchands qui prenaient mes propres récoltes, et je vécus ainsi sur un fonds de roulement emprunté et commode, dont je me rendais un compte approximatif et inexact."[1]

Other financial burdens which Lamartine imposed upon himself originated from a desire to keep the ancestral estates together, and to become a great land-owner. With these objects in view, he purchased the shares of his sisters in the family lands, and spent large sums of money for their improvement, and in the purchase of nearby land, only to find that the revenues from the properties were insufficient to meet the costs.

Year after year the struggle continues. A sale of personal property—horses, books, pictures—and unencumbered lands, in 1844, together with 250,000 francs obtained the following year from the sale of the copyright for twelve years of *Les Girondins*,[2] gave him hope of complete liquidation within three years. This hope was deceived, for in 1849, when he retired from active political life, after passing rapidly from the greatest public favor to the greatest degree of unpopularity, he found himself hopelessly involved.[3] His popularity during the troublous times of the revolution of 1848, in which he played so important a rôle, was costly; M. Edouard Grenier in his *Souvenirs littéraires* informs us that Mme de Lamartine admitted to him one day that their charities for a few months alone in this year had exceeded 100,000 francs.[4]

Lamartine's acts of charity were many, for one of the most attractive qualities of the poet was his kindness of heart and open-handed generosity. Frequent accounts occur of the ready help which he extended to colleagues and friends, even in his later years of misfortune.[5] On the other hand, some of his gifts may be regarded as a

[1] *Œuvres complètes* de Lamartine (Paris, 1860–63), XL, 64.

[2] *Correspondance*, IV, 208.

[3] See article by M. Léon Séché in the *Revue des Français*, April, 1911, p. 273.

[4] *Souvenirs littéraires*, par Edouard Grenier (Paris, 1894), p. 27.

[5] See article entitled "Lamartine et l'école romantique," by M. Léon Séché (*Annales Romantiques*, II, 312).

mixture of charity and politics, such as the donations of his earlier years described by him in a letter to his intimate friend, the comte de Virieu, in which he announces his defeat in an election at Mâcon:—"Or je ne crois pas qu'il y ait une condition plus populaire que la mienne à Mâcon . . . j'ai fait pour 40,000 francs de routes à mes frais, j'ai donné 2,000 francs au choléra; j'ai donné cette année 25,000 francs de livres à la Bibliothèque de la ville, etc., etc., etc.; j'ai marché à la tête de la garde nationale, etc., etc., etc."[1] The result of all these efforts he announced earlier in the letter: "J'ai été ballotté avec un serrurier tapageur, et le serrurier a été nommé!" In the *Correspondance* for 1848, we find, similarly, a letter to the mayor of Mâcon in which Lamartine promises a subscription of five thousand francs toward the establishment in that city of a *comptoir d'escompte*, and also sends two thousand francs to be distributed for charitable purposes among the workingmen of the city; these gifts are accompanied by the request that the mayor announce the fact in the newspaper of Mâcon.[2]

At the end of his political career, Lamartine, in order to recoup his losses, turns to his Asiatic estate near Smyrna, which the sultan, Abdul Medjid, had given him. We find him still optimistic in spite of his many failures—fortune is still just a step ahead of him. After visiting this great estate, he writes to one of his friends: "C'est véritablement la *Limagne* d'Asie, il y a la fortune sous quarante ou cinquante formes,"[3] and a letter of the following day to another friend is equally enthusiastic:—"Je suis ébloui. Il y a la fortune de cent spéculateurs et de mille agriculteurs."[4] Unfortunately, men with capital did not share his enthusiasm. He returned empty-handed from a trip to London in search of capital, although he writes with some gratification: "La cité a voulu me recevoir en banquet à Covent-Garden," and adds the somewhat surprising detail: "Les chemins de fer et les paquebots et les hôtels sur la route n'ont pas voulu recevoir un shelling de moi, disant que j'étais l'hôte de l'Angleterre pacifique."[5]

[1] Letter of June 22, 1837, *Correspondance*, III, 427.
[2] Letter of March, 1848, *Correspondance*, IV, 277.
[3] Letter of July 16, 1850, *Correspondance*, IV, 320.
[4] Letter of July 17, 1850, *Correspondance*, IV, 321.
[5] *Correspondance*, IV, 334–35.

The *coup d'état* which placed Napoleon III on the throne in 1852 was an additional blow to Lamartine, particularly because a ban was placed on the publication of his popular political paper, *Le Conseiller du peuple*, which had a subscription list of eighty thousand names. It was at this time that he felt obliged to leave his beautiful apartment, 82 rue de l'Université, in order to make his home at the address indicated in the letter printed above, in a gloomy *rez-de-chaussée*, at the rear of the courtyard. Three rooms were retained for housekeeping while the rest of the apartment was turned into a combined bookstore and printing establishment, where our author edited and published, himself, various works, including the forty-volume edition of his *Œuvres complètes*,[1] which bears as evidence on its title-page the words: "Chez l'auteur, rue de la Ville L'Evêque, 43."[2]

Misfortunes continue steadily during the next decade, and in 1860 the beloved family estate of Milly is sold.[3] Lamartine is now seventy years of age, yet in spite of illness he struggles on courageously for several years, but with little hope of relief. The twenty-fourth of November, 1864, just eleven days before the date of our letter, the fact that he appreciates the hopelessness of his condition is indicated by the following words in a letter to his friend, the baron de Chamborant: "L'heure de mon dépouillement absolu approche: à peine ai-je le temps de réfléchir au coup qui nous menace. J'ai eu cependant des créanciers obligeants et de très belles récoltes. Mais la destinée est plus forte que la Providence."[4] His main hope at this time was in a great number of subscriptions to the edition of his *Œuvres complètes*, in behalf of which the letter at the beginning of this article was written, but the public was no longer interested in the writer, and the edition did not find many subscribers.

[1] The part which Mme de Lamartine took, as proofreader, in the publication of this edition is described in an interesting manner by M. Charles Alexandre in an article in *Le Correspondant*, September 10, 1884.

[2] This apartment, with its contents, was disposed of by public sale in 1867, two years before the death of its owner, to meet a mortgage held by the Crédit Foncier. Lamartine at that time was lodged in a villa, avenue de l'Empereur (now number 109, avenue Henri-Martin), a lodging granted to him in 1860 by the city of Paris and occupied by him until his death.

[3] In his article entitled "Sur un Manuscrit de Lamartine" (*Les Annales Romantiques*, IX [1912], 152), M. Louis Barthou publishes a list of debts drawn up by Lamartine, February 19, 1859, which shows a deficit of over two million francs.

[4] *Lamartine inconnu*, par A. de Chamborant de Périssat (Paris, 1891), p. 268.

The last letter from which quotations may be made to complete this portion of the financial history was written at Paris, August 1, 1866, not long before the illness which deprived the poet, for the remainder of his life, of the free use of his faculties. This letter furnishes a grand total for the earnings of Lamartine, and at the same time shows the feeling of legitimate pride which the writer took in his brave though unsuccessful struggle:—"J'afficherai quand on voudra, sur tous les murs de Paris, que j'ai *effectivement payé plus de six millions* en quatorze ans d'efforts surhumains, sans avoir reçu un sou du gouvernement, excepté l'autorisation accordée à tout le monde d'une loterie qui n'a pas coûté un sou ni aux contribuables ni à l'Etat."[1]

The use of the words "quatorze ans d'efforts surhumains," in the above letter, are amply justified, for poet though he was, none of his misfortunes can be ascribed to a want of capacity for hard work. An examination of his early letters shows that he was a hard worker even before he was forced to be so by financial necessities. His early poems were the result of much thought, and his success later as an orator in the Chambre des Députés was largely due, according to his own confession, to incessant labor. "Je travaille, travaille, travaille comme au collège" he writes in 1838 while a member of this body,[2] and in a letter of the preceding year he had made the following hazardous admission: "Je fais en secret des vers par milliers depuis six semaines, entre quatre heures du matin et le jour. Si les électeurs le savaient!"[3] He was a tremendous worker in his later years. A letter from the year 1852 furnishes evidence that, at the age of sixty-two, he finished a volume of four hundred pages in twenty-four days,[4] while five years later, when sixty-seven years old, five hundred pages of his *Vie d'Alexandre le Grand* were completed in thirty days.[5] His literary reputation suffered greatly from this method of work, but the energy and determination of the aged writer in his efforts to meet thus his financial obligations call for admiration.

[1] *Lamartine inconnu*, p. 272.

[2] *Correspondance*, III, 452.

[3] *Ibid.*, III, 441.

[4] *Lamartine inconnu*, p. 106.

[5] Letter of Mlle Valentine de Cessia (October 31, 1857), *Lamartine inconnu*, p. 157.

Lamartine was not understood in his day, and during the last years of his life it was the fashion to deride his weaknesses and to belittle his greatness. He was caricatured in the papers and ridiculed in the music-halls; the impecuniosity of the poet was held up to scorn, all possible changes being rung on the bitter jest that in his case the *lyre* had become a *tirelire*, and similar unkind witticisms. In these present days, when the lapse of fifty years since the death of Lamartine makes a proper perspective of his works possible, his literary achievements take a high rank. In a like manner his life, viewed through his letters, contains many praiseworthy features. The few weaknesses which have been touched upon in this article are counterbalanced by admirable traits of character, not the least of which is that sense of personal honor which forced him to such arduous toil in order to meet his financial obligations.

D. H. CARNAHAN

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

BERTRAND DE BAR-SUR-AUBE AND *AYMERI DE NARBONNE*

In 1903 (*Romania*, XXXII, 353–56) Suchier showed that Scholastica, daughter of Henry II of Champagne, having married Guillaume V of Vienne, Count of Mâcon, it is more than probable that Bertrand de Bar-sur-Aube wrote the chanson *Girart de Vienne* for Guillaume and Scholastica, in view of the fact that the counts of Vienne boasted of having the epic hero for their ancestor. The marriage is supposed to have been concluded about 1190; Guillaume having died in 1224, it follows that *Girart de Vienne* was composed during the period 1190 to 1224.

As for the chanson *Aymeri de Narbonne*, Louis Demaison, in the introduction to his critical edition of the poem, shows that it was composed between 1205 and 1225 (pp. 81, 89–91). Demaison and Suchier are both of the opinion that *Girart de Vienne* is anterior to *Aymeri de Narbonne* (Demaison, pp. 73–77; Suchier, introduction to *Les Narbonnais*, 1898, p. 54). Demaison thinks that neither of the two poems can lay claim to originality, but that Bertrand has used two older poems, enriching their action by numerous episodes drawn from his own imagination; that, in other words, both the extant poems are only *rifacimenti* of lost originals (pp. 92–97). The messengers sent to Pavia, their adventures during their stay in the capital, their fight against the Germans, the taking of Narbonne by the Saracens and its final conquest by the French, all this seems to have been brought in by Bertrand.

It will be seen very soon that the Savari episode, in which a hateful rôle is given the Germans and which has repeatedly attracted the attention of the critics, allows a greater precision in dating the chanson.

Some details of the episode in question are necessary; I quote from the edition of *Aymeri de Narbonne* by Louis Demaison (Société des anciens textes français, Paris, 1887).

On their trip to Italy, to the court of the Lombard King Boniface, the ambassadors of Aymeri, among whom knights like Girart de Roussillon, Hugo and Gui are especially to be noted, soon after

passing the Alps meet with a squadron of three hundred German knights. Their leader, Savari, addresses the French band in the most insolent manner, asking them the purpose of their expedition (vss. 1609–46):

Vont s'en li mes sanz nule demorée . . .
Chevauchant vont a grant esperonnée,
Tant qu'il costoient .I. brueil, lez une prée . . .
A tant encontrent a senestre, a l'entrée,
I. Alemant de molt grant renommée,
Viellarz estoit, s'ot la barbe mellée;
C'ert Savaris qui grant gent a menée:
IIIc estoient, chascuns la teste armée,
Des Alemanz des mieuz de sa contrée.
Vestu estoient comme gent mal senée:
Chascuns avoit une gonele lée
Et une jupe de gros agniax forrée,
Solers a ganches et chauces havetées,
Aumuce el chief et par devant orlée.
Si ot chascuns ceinte molt longue espée,
Une toise ot, s'ele fust mesurée,
Et targe avoit roonde au col posée.
Et si chevauchent comme gent forsenée:
Tel i ot ive a qeue recopée
Ou haut cheval a grant teste levée.
Et qant il ont nostre gent avisée,
En haut s'escriënt comme gent desfaée
"Godehelspe!" a molt grant alenée.
Mes Savaris qui ot la barbe lée,
Parla romanz, que la terre ot usée;
Contre noz contes s'en vet de randonée;
Qant pres d'eus fu, s'a sa voiz escriée:
"Ou iroiz vos, fole gent esgarée?
"Qui est vos sire et de quele contrée?
"Normanz senblez, c'est verité provée,
"Qui tel orgueil menez et tel ponée.
"Ainz que voiez de Pavie l'entrée,
"Sera molt chier cele robe achetée;
"N'en enmenroiz vaillant une denrée!"

Girart de Roussillon informs Savari of the object of their expedition. Savari maintains, in the same arrogant tone, that he has been promised the hand of Hermengart and that he will never allow the

French to proceed on their journey. Count Gui, angry at this insolence, tells his countrymen to get ready for battle; the Germans prepare on their part and attack the French in a vigorous assault, shouting their battle cry "Godeherre." Savari does not show himself especially eager for the honor of fighting in the first rank. He keeps his own person in the background, leaving his people to fight for him. Only once he feels enough courage to attack Hugo from behind, wounding him slightly with his spear; but when Hugo turns his horse, he flees before his opponent can attack him. The battle goes on, Savari's nephew, Goniot, kills Aymeri de Losengne, but is mortally wounded by Girart de Roussillon, whereupon the latter kills another German, called Hugo. A second assault of the Germans, who are still by far superior in numbers, is equally unsuccessful. A German, called Gracien, wounds Girart de Roussillon from behind, throwing him from his horse. For this treachery he is justly punished by Gui, who kills him. Savari flees with the few knights who survive, hoping to have his revenge later and trusting in the assistance of his brother, Bishop Morant of Verciaus (Verceil, Piedmont) (vss. 1666–1940). I quote the passage showing Savari's cowardice (vss. 1932–40):

Qant Savaris voit cel encombrement,
A l'einz qu'il pot, s'en est tornez fuiant.
Dist a ses homes: "N'alez plus atendant!
"Ce sont deable, par le mien esciënt!
"Se a Verciaus estions ça devant,
"Lors avrions et secors et garant:
"Mes freres est li evesques Morant;
"Vengera nos de ceste male gent,
"Qui ça derrier nos chacent . . . ."

The poet asserts that Savari was the first to flee, far ahead of his men and so precipitately that there was no hope for the pursuing Frenchmen to reach him. He continues his flight to Verciaus, yet the townspeople refuse to open the gate to him; they even throw stones on the heads of his knights. Nay, he has to undergo a still greater humiliation: a Lombard (that is, a coward, the Lombards being generally considered as cowards during the middle ages) wounds him and throws him from his horse (vss. 1941–75). The French ambassadors continue their journey to Pavia.

Savari, however, does not forget his shameful defeat. He is waiting in ambush for the French to pass by on their trip home. Hugo, foreseeing the danger, persuades his comrades to descend from their mules and to mount their steeds. Savari incites his vassals to take revenge for the defeat inflicted upon them, while Hugo cheers on his little squadron against the coward Savari (vss. 1952–2792). The latter summons the French to surrender (vss. 2798–2803):

> Randez vos tost, fiz a putain, gloton!
> Ne vos vadroit la desfanse .I. bouton.
> En Alemengne vos menrai en prison;
> A mon talant en prendrai venjoison,
> Et si me plest, s'en avrai raençon!

The battle begins. A hundred new men come to help Savari, shouting "Godehelpe" in a loud voice, and kill Hugo's horse. The little band of French knights is suffering greatly from the superiority in numbers of the enemy. They take refuge in a nearby tower. While Hugo sets out for Narbonne to inform Aymeri of what has happened, the knights in the tower are well received by the owner, a "vavassal." The Germans lay siege to the tower. Hugo brings the news to Aymeri who heads a rescue. Noticing the approach of Aymeri's army, Savari's cowardice reveals itself again in a decision to flee. But Hugo, foreseeing this, prevents the flight of the enemy. Savari is terror-stricken; he drops from his horse, imploring his enemy to spare his life, and is taken prisoner. The rest of the Germans flee in all directions; some of them are killed, some escape. Hugo delivers Savari up to the owner of the tower, that he might get a large ransom and thus be rewarded for his good services. (vss. 2802–3236.)

As can be seen from the résumé given and the passages quoted, Savari and his German knights are depicted in the worst light: their arrogance toward people whom they suppose to be weaker than themselves, their cowardice and their having resort to treachery was surely meant by the poet to have some effect on his hearers or readers. This rôle given to the Germans is the more striking since it is unique in the literature of the Chansons de Geste. For Gui d'Allemagne, in the *Couronnement de Louis*, is little more than a figure-head; the same can be said of the emperor in *Bœve de Hamstone*. The rôle of

the Saxons cannot be considered, because the religious motif comes into play, the Saxons being pagans like the Saracens. Why then did Bertrand de Bar ascribe this rôle to the Germans? It is likely that a satisfactory solution of the problem can be found in the political circumstances of the poet's time.

Thibaut III, Count of Champagne, died May 24, 1201, in the midst of active preparations for his participation in the Fourth Crusade, leaving his wife, Blanche of Navarre, regent for his posthumous son, Thibaut IV, later the famous Thibaut le Chansonnier. From the first day of her widowhood Blanche had to defend herself against the attacks and intrigues of numerous enemies, who tried to deprive her and her child of their fief. The most dangerous of them all was no doubt Erard de Brienne, husband of Philippina, daughter of Henry II, Count of Champagne. Philippina was a pretender to the dignity of countess of that fief, while Henry II was a most powerful enemy because of his connections with several grandees of Burgundy and, above all, with Thibaut I, Duke of Lorraine, and his German vassals. Blanche succeeded in holding her own, thanks to her wise policy of securing the aid of Philip Augustus, King of France, which she obtained, not without making numerous concessions and sacrifices. In doing so, she had acted very wisely, foreseeing perhaps the great development which royalty was to take in the course of the 13th century. So she took without hesitation the part of the French King in his struggle with the German Emperor Otto IV. The decisive part taken by the nobility of Champagne on the battlefield of Bouvines is well known. They formed the right wing of the French position, and the destruction of the host of the Count of Flanders was due to their vigorous assault under the leadership of men like Hugues de Mareuil, who took prisoner Ferrand of Flanders, the Count of Saint-Pol, and Count Henry of Bar-le-Duc. With so much at stake in this struggle and with the actual spectacle of a German invading army before the people, it would be but natural that feeling in Champagne should run very high and that sentiments of hatred and antipathy against the Germans should be uttered. However we are not left to rely on this supposition alone. D'Arbois de Jubainville, in his *Histoire des Ducs et Comtes de Champagne*, II, pp. 17–18, mentions two registers of the chancery of Champagne,

testifying the joy of Blanche when she heard of the defeat suffered by Otto IV: she gave a fief as a reward to the messenger who brought the good news. D'Arbois de Jubainville gives the text of one of them:

> Manesiers de Cosances, escuier mi sires li rois, hom liges a Madame la contesse de sa meson fort o tot le porpris et de L arpanz de terre que Madame la contesse li donna a essarter, quant il aporta les lettres de la victoire mi sires li rois, que les contes de Flandres, de Bouloigne et de Salebere estoient pris.

The most bitter enemy of Blanche, Thibaut I of Lorraine, had fought at Bouvines among the troops of Otto IV. Having escaped from the disaster, he continued to help Erard de Brienne in a sort of guerilla warfare which the latter adopted against Blanche, a war which was brought to an end by the interference of Pope Honorius III, who excommunicated Erard and his adherents, and of Frederick II, who took prisoner the Duke of Lorraine in 1218. It is very likely that those events did nothing to increase the little esteem in which the Germans were held by the inhabitants of Champagne since the day of Bouvines.

One last point. We have a document dated August 14, 1217, in which Blanche invites Manassès de Rosson and all the inhabitants of Aubepierre to take the oath of fidelity before the bishop of Langres. The place of the meeting was to be Bar-sur-Aube. The last visit paid by Blanche to Bar had been made in 1205, and we possess no document showing that she had taken up her residence in the castle of Bar during the interval, although we cannot complain of a lack of documents for that particular period. If she had not set foot in the old castle since 1205, there is nothing more natural than that her arrival and the whole meeting should have assumed the character of a festival. It is quite probable that on this occasion Bertrand composed the song on the defeats of Savari and his followers, the days of Bouvines and the German invasion of the country serving as a background in the minds of his hearers, many of whom no doubt had seen with their own eyes the clumsy apparel and heard the cry of "Godechelespe" of the hosts of Otto IV.

To summarize what has been said: the chanson *Aymeri de Narbonne*, in its extant form, seems to have been composed under the influence of the battle of Bouvines, won by Philip Augustus and the

knights of Champagne on the 27th of July, 1214. When considering the poem in its structure, its spirit, and the large majority of its episodes, we find that it differs but little from the rest of the Chansons de Geste. Its make-up is that of the average Old French epic poem, with a goodly number of battle scenes, duels, sieges, and insolent messages. Its spirit breathes the religious fervor of the crusades, which in a general way considers the European world as one great nation, the people of God, who are fighting against His enemies, the Saracens. The great majority of the episodes are more or less commonplaces with well-known motifs, such as that of the cowardly Lombards, the princess giving way to her passion, etc. But the Savari episode, which occupies altogether a space of 918 verses, that is, about one-fifth of the whole poem, indicates a new spirit. It is for the first time that representatives of two Christian nations are seen to fight a regular Chanson de Geste battle. No longer do the German knights gather around the banner of Charlemagne, as auxiliaries of the French, to attack the common enemy of Christendom; no longer do they form an integral part of the great Christian and French army, the embodiment of the mediaeval ideal of a world-theocracy. The Savari episode reveals the existence of two different nations with an independent national spirit, with their characteristics as they appeared to the biassed mind of the French minstrel, but none the less pronounced and based upon actual facts. The French national spirit has been aroused, certainly under the influence of the victory of Bouvines. And it is significant that at the same period Walther von der Vogelweide on the other side of the Rhine expressed the same feelings of national pride. But still a certain local patriotism seems to be a great deal stronger than nationalism, and while in France at large the victory does not seem to have deeply stirred the people, in a corner of Champagne a minstrel puts into the frame of a Chanson de Geste all his antipathy against the invaders. It was in all probability the hatred of the population of Champagne for Thibaut I of Lorraine and his German vassals, the enemies of the regent Blanche of Navarre, which inspired the poet. Consequently, *Aymeri de Narbonne* was possibly composed after the battle of Bouvines, probably between July 1214 and 1218, year of the final defeat of Thibaut I of Lorraine, and more precisely, about 1217,

date of the arrival of Blanche at Bar-sur-Aube, at the time of the impending defeat of her enemies.

Girart de Vienne being anterior to *Aymeri de Narbonne*, it would follow that the former of the two poems was composed between 1190 and 1214 (1217).

ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE

CHICAGO

THE TECHNIQUE OF SCRIBE'S *COMÉDIES-VAUDEVILLES*

The two men who, before 1850, did the most to improve and perfect the technique and mechanical construction of the French drama were Beaumarchais and Scribe. Before the time of *Le Barbier de Séville*, plot and action had made very little progress, at least in the comedy; and if all the tragedies of Racine and some of those of Corneille are models of theatrical carpentry, this fact results more from the strength of passion and the truth of the characterizations than from any ingenious combinations in the plot. Molière, Regnard, and Marivaux offer very little improvement. The most carefully constructed of Molière's plays, *Les Femmes savantes*, ends in the most elementary way, by means of a fictitious letter. In Marivaux there is scarcely any plot. The *Barbier de Séville* and the *Mariage de Figaro* bring the comedy of intrigue for the first time to a high point of development, both of them skilful pieces of theatrical sleight-of-hand, attacked and developed with a sureness of touch for which one will find no precedent in French dramatic literature, going back even to *Le Menteur*. These two plays lead directly, with such intermediaries as *Les Etourdis* of Andrieux, *La Jeunesse de Henri V* of Duval, and *Les Marionnettes* of Picard, to whom belongs the most important place in the history of the comedy between Beaumarchais and Scribe, to the school of the *pièce bien faite*, with Scribe at its head.

It is a commonplace that Scribe was the greatest technician in the history of the French drama and that all the dramatists of the nineteenth century who aimed at constructive excellence profit, consciously or unconsciously, from the new models which he gave to dramatic art, and show his influence as an inventor and manager of plots. It is perhaps not so clearly realized that he first displayed and exercised his technical skill in an inferior *genre*, the *comédie-vaudeville*, for which he practically invented a new form, raising it to a height never before reached, and making of it a vehicle for light sketching of manners. Scribe's best five-act comedies are, as far as

technique is concerned, merely highly developed *comédies-vaudevilles*. The comedy of manners of Augier, the *pièce à thèse* of Dumas fils, and all the plays of Sardou, derive their form and construction from the comedies and *comédies-vaudevilles* of Scribe.

The *comédie-vaudeville* of the eighteenth century was characterized by technical inferiority, literary worthlessness, and vulgarity. Since the days of Lesage, Favart, and Panard, it had followed two courses, tending to be either the rehandling of some anecdote or incident, or a satirical criticism of the vices and follies of the day. In either case its greatest charm lay in its gaiety, its rapidity of action, and in the more or less farcical handling of the situations. It remained faithful to its origins, always smacking of the fair, and possessed to a high degree the two essential elements of the farce: actuality and general satire. During and after the Revolution of 1789 the *comédie-vaudeville* flourished as never before, and, in the hands of Bouilly, Radet, Piis, Desfontaines, and Barré, began to show evidences of greater literary worth, although it remained for Scribe to make of it a real literary *genre*.

Scribe desired, above all, to attract and amuse large audiences, and he realized that he could best do this by giving them light pieces with brilliantly developed plots, full of complications and *quidproquos*, enlivened by witty dialogue and graceful verses. A public worn out emotionally by the horrors of the Revolution and by the disasters of the Empire could best be entertained if its curiosity were aroused by a skilfully prepared plot, if its interest were held by a brilliant development of this plot, and if its expectations were satisfied by a logical, constantly foreseen dénoûment. Clearness and logic being two qualities which Scribe possessed to the highest degree, he employed them with the realization that to hold his public he must be clear, and that if he were to be clear, he must so order his action and plot that the spectator could follow easily and with pleasure the different courses of the action.

Among the gifts with which Scribe was more highly endowed than any other dramatist of the nineteenth century was that theatrical instinct which enabled him to see at a glance the essentially dramatic elements of a situation. He lived, moved, and had his being in things theatrical; the incidents of everyday life were to him so many

dramatic possibilities and he saw in everything a source of stage material. The most ordinary situation, the most unpromising anecdote, the scene least likely to suggest theatrical possibilities to one less gifted with this sense of the theater, gave him ideas which he would translate into dramatic action. Perhaps no one has ever had more then he the ability to see instantly which side of a situation would be most interesting when set before the public; no dramatic author has excelled him in the power to discover at each moment theatrical combinations of new and striking effect. He was able not only to discover these dramatic situations, but to translate them instantly into stage pictures; he did not have to develop and perfect them slowly. This fertility of dramatic invention explains in part his extraordinary popularity during the twenty-five years in which he reigned supreme in the four or five best theaters of Paris.

For many years, ever since Théophile Gautier began his merciless attacks upon his popular contemporary, and ever since Théodore de Banville called him "Mossou Scribe," it has been customary to dismiss Scribe with a word, as being simply a dramatic carpenter, as one devoid of those higher qualities of the dramatic author, and as a mere mechanician. Yet the fact remains that it is not every writer for the stage that has that genius for making people see things in a certain way, not necessarily the true way, but which seems momentarily the only way, to those whom the author wishes to persuade that they have seen what he sees. To be able to do this, one must be gifted with an inborn sense of perspective, of dramatic values, which enables one to sketch a character or a passion in a word. Scribe's originality and fertility of invention are conspicuous in his handling of stage conventions. To a certain extent the plot of a *comédie-vaudeville* is necessarily conventional. The obdurate father, the sentimental heroine, the interested and the disinterested lover, the scheming valet or soubrette, love quarrels, jealousies, mistakes, and disguises—all those things by which the machinery of a plot is kept in motion, remain in substance the same. Scribe shows the greatest ingenuity in varying these combinations, when possible; when not, he presents them under an aspect which gives a new direction to our sympathies, boldly siding with the parent against

the lover, with prudence and calculation against rashness and extravagance. Indeed, he is most successful when he goes against the established current of theatrical sympathies; his championship of reason against romance, his defense of common sense as opposed to sentiment and passion, are resources by recurring to which he endeavors to impart new aspects to hackneyed and conventional stage themes.

No less noticeable is his dexterity in handling a complicated plot. There are many of his plays whose plots involve some absurdity or improbability, in which certain scenes hover on the brink of melodramatic exaggeration, yet by his discretion, and by his constant command of effective dialogue, he winds himself out of all his entanglements just as the spectator is beginning to think his case hopeless. No matter what the inherent weakness of a plot, he always manages to impart to it at least a temporary and artificial *vraisemblance.*

Scribe's dramatic theory, if indeed he had so clearly formulated his ideas and methods as to make of them a theory, was that one event may, by its influence, produce others, acting upon each other and mingling their effects until the impetus of the original event has been spent. For him the dramatic interest and value of a situation lay, not in the clash of characters and will that it may produce, nor in the study of the passions causing it or arising from it, but in the combination of circumstances and complexity of interests it may bring about. He selects some incident of ordinary life which to him seems curious or interesting. This fact is put in action; in its course it comes into collision with various obstacles placed artfully in its way, from which it rebounds until, after a certain number of recoils and springs, it stops, its force of action having been spent. This conception of dramatic art by its nature relieves the author of the responsibility of taking account of characters, sentiment, or passion.

Fertility of invention, dexterity in selecting the proper elements of a situation, and ingenuity in arranging these elements did not go alone in Scribe; to them he added that without which these gifts would have been of little avail: careful and effective planning of the various scenes of the play. He was not satisfied to present his scenes in a haphazard fashion; he trusted neither to luck nor to

wit to redeem a badly constructed plot. So important to him was the plan that he often said: "When I have finished my plan, I have nothing more to do." He insisted that every entrance and exit should be in its proper place and that the scenes should follow each other in the clearest and most logical order. Scribe's chief desire being to entertain, he realized that to do this he must first of all be clear, so that nothing might be unexplained or misunderstood.

To accomplish this, his first concern was to see that in the opening scenes the subject should be well exposed and the audience sure as to what the action was to concern. The expositions in his plays are nearly always clear and firmly handled. The different threads of the action are skilfully stretched and the entire exposition is so enlivened with bright dialogue and pretty couplets that the machinery is cleverly disguised and the audience listens patiently.

But to be clear would not have been enough had the action moved fitfully, rapid here and lagging there; to hold the interest of the spectator, whose interest has been aroused by a dexterous exposition, it is essential that everything tend, directly or indirectly, to hasten the solution of the difficulties encountered in the course of the action. If certain characters are superfluous, if one or two scenes are digressive and retard the march of events, interfering with the play of the various forces upon each other, the spectator grows restless and the spell is broken. This constant, logical progression of events is a characteristic of nearly all of Scribe's vaudevilles.

Knowing that nothing is so apt to annoy an audience as to have some incident occur without warning, Scribe was always careful to scatter here and there in the early parts of the play words which at the time seemed of no consequence but which prepared the mind of the listener for the great event in the later scenes. Nothing is left to be taken on faith by the audience; all that happens is the logical result of what has happened earlier, or what has been hinted at. No less responsible for his hold upon the public was his practice of taking the spectator into his confidence, of letting him know the things which were withheld from some of the characters in the play. In this way he succeeded in establishing some kind of a tacit understanding between himself and his audience that certain situations, which, if examined too closely, were improbable or farcical, were temporarily

to be accepted. More than this, he realized that it is human nature to enjoy being in a secret, and that the pleasure derived from watching the efforts of a character to overcome a certain difficulty, but constantly baffled by ignorance of some condition which the onlooker knows well, is greater than that of being kept in the dark and being made to wonder just what is wrong. The comic element in his plays is nearly always the result of the situations themselves, in which some of the characters are talking or acting with one object in view, while the others have something else in mind. In such scenes the actions are always at cross-purposes and the spectator is the only one who knows the secret of the situation.

Having thus clearly exposed the subject, arranged each incident and scene in its proper place, so ordered the action that it is rapid and constant, and always sufficiently explained, he brings it to a logical, even inevitable, conclusion. He probably did not, however, work in the order just described; the dénoûment being the most vital part of a play, he always had it clearly in mind before the plot was fully developed. He was aware that a hastily accomplished dénoûment, convenient, but not logical, would spoil the best play and disgruntle the most indulgent audience. That the dénoûment should be the only real consequence of the combinations of characters and events was a fundamental law with him, and in his most complicated pieces he never loses sight of what is to be the outcome of all the *péripéties* and *coups de théâtre* with which he complicates the action. Everything tends toward one end, which every element of the play announces and prepares for, and each scene makes the spectator more anxious to know the outcome.

Thus, starting with the conventional *vaudeville farce*, *vaudeville anecdotique* and *vaudeville satirique*, Scribe, by early applying the formula of the intensive plot, of the plot built upon a dovetailing of *quidproquos*, had before long developed the *genre* into a *vaudeville intrigué*. Having thus made of the vaudeville a more pretentious form by grafting it on to the *comédie d'intrigue*, he gradually enlarged the new vaudeville, by weaving into it a sketch of manners, until he reached the comedy of manners. In the transformation of the vaudeville into the *comédie-vaudeville de mœurs*, three stages may be noticed: first, there is a modification in the structure of the play,

a more careful combination of the various elements, greater dexterity in building the framework and more logical arrangement in the succession of scenes, in the action and in the dénoûment. Second, the rôle of the couplet is gradually reduced until finally it disappears completely. Third, the later plays, while keeping their humorous and sparkling quality, become somewhat more sentimental in tone, more reserved and more restrained than the lighter *vaudeville-farce*.

NEIL C. ARVIN

RICE INSTITUTE
HOUSTON, TEX.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Casos Cervantinos que Tocan a Valladolid. By Narciso Alonso Cortés. Madrid: Junta para Ampliación de Estudios e Investigaciones Científicas, 1916.

The third centennial of Cervantes' death has produced something better than the florid oratory common on such occasions. Many new facts have been discovered throwing light upon the author of *Don Quijote*, his family and friends. Recent as is the publication of Fitzmaurice-Kelly's admirable biography (*Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra. A Memoir*), one can no longer trust that work alone for a complete knowledge of the facts of Cervantes' life. A new edition is already desirable. Rodríguez Marín, Amezúa, González Aurioles, Ortega, and Alonso Cortés have all contributed new information. If most of it is of slight importance, the sum total is very respectable.

In the present book Alonso Cortés deals mainly with the Cervantes family as related to Valladolid. Rodríguez Marín had shown that Córdoba was the real home of the family and that the connection with Alcalá de Henares, the novelist's birthplace, was only temporary. The present author tries to trace back the family history farther, to Talavera. He shows that numerous members of the clan Cervantes inhabited that town, but he is unsuccessful in connecting the southern branch of the family with that of the north. True, Cervantes terms Talavera *la mejor tierra de Castilla*, but this encomium hardly proves that he regarded the town as the family *solar*. Alonso Cortés is on firmer ground when he begins to consider the history of the Licenciate Juan de Cervantes, Miguel's grandfather. Rodríguez Marín has shown that the latter settled in Alcalá de Henares in 1505, where his son Rodrigo was born, and that he resided there six years. In 1516 we find him back in Córdoba and in 1523 holding the post of *teniente de corregidor* in Cuenca. Every lover of Cervantes would like to believe with Rodríguez Marín that in sketching the portrait of the poor and upright *teniente de corregidor* in *La Gitanilla* the author took his own grandfather as a model. Unfortunately it is difficult to reconcile the ideal portrait with the facts concerning the Licenciado Juan now brought to light. In 1528 he held the post of *oidor del Consejo del duque del Infantado* in Guadalajara. Alonso Cortés has unearthed the documents of a most unsavory suit between Juan's daughter María and the Archdeacon Martín de Mendoza. It would appear that the father not only winked at the illicit relations of his daughter with

this dissolute prelate of influential family, but also abetted her in a blackmailing suit which she brought against him. It has long been known that two of Miguel's sisters and his daughter Isabel were adventuresses constantly seeking to involve unwary lovers in the toils of the law. We now know that this unpleasant family tradition which persisted for three generations started with the novelist's aunt, María. Such unpleasant discoveries illustrate the dangers of genealogical research. Poverty could not be pleaded in extenuation. Witnesses depose that Juan de Cervantes maintained *gran fausto de casa*. They associated with nobles, participated in tilts and tournies, had slaves, servants, pages, and outriders, wore silks and other costly fineries. How different from the household which could not produce a piece of silver with which to cross the gypsy's palm!

Such prosperity did not long accompany Rodrigo de Cervantes, the surgeon, and his family. Rodrigo seems to have left Alcalá for Valladolid about 1551, when Miguel was only four years old. The father soon became a victim of extortion on the part of a certain Gregorio Romano. He was imprisoned for debt, and to secure release instituted a *pleito de hidalguía*. He had no difficulty in establishing his noble rank, but to regain solvency was a different matter. Plainly Rodrigo de Cervantes was a ne'er-do-well. The documents in the Romano trial enable us to follow the dismal fortunes of the family in Valladolid through 1553. Alonso Cortés plausibly conjectures that they continued to reside in that city until 1561, when they appear in Madrid. Much interesting material is given concerning the Trinitarian father, Juan Gil, whose biography Señor Ortega is now writing, about the Valladolid poets mentioned in the *Canto de Caliope*, and concerning the family of the novelist's wife, Catalina de Salazar. The final chapter, devoted to Cervantes' last stay in Valladolid, contains little new material. Suffice it to say that no documentary evidence has been found proving his presence there previous to 1605.

Señor Alonso Cortés is to be congratulated on the acquisition of important new material and his honesty in not attempting to gloss over unpleasantnesses. Many interesting details are here passed over in silence. In interpreting his documents he occasionally indulges in too much speculation.

GEORGE T. NORTHUP

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVI *August 1918* NUMBER 4

THE INFERNAL COUNCIL

The purpose of this study is to trace the development of the "Infernal Council" from Claudian and the Gospel of Nicodemus, through Robert de Boron, Boccaccio, Sannazaro, Vida, and Tasso, to Milton.[1]

I

At the end of the fourth century of our era, Claudian composed two Latin poems, *In Rufinum* and *De Raptu Proserpinae*, which had a very great influence upon later writers, especially because of the descriptions of councils in Hell with which they begin. The *In Rufinum* was intended both as an invective against Rufinus, the ambitious minister of Arcadius, Emperor of the East, and as a bit of flattery for the Western Emperor and for his general Stilicho. Rufinus is represented as an envoy of Hell, the monsters of which have sat in solemn conclave and determined that the world is too happy. As war on Heaven seems likely to prove disastrous, it is resolved to accept the suggestion of Megaera, to send her foster-child Rufinus to wreak ruin among men.[2]

The opening scene in *De Raptu Proserpinae* is likewise an infernal council, called this time by Pluto, who is enraged because he is

[1] Professor E. H. Wilkins, now of the University of Chicago, suggested this subject to me some years ago, when I was under his instruction at Harvard University. While Professor Wilkins has been helpful in many ways in the assembling of the materials for this article, he is in no sense responsible for the conclusions reached.

[2] See T. R. Glover, *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century*, Cambridge, 1901, p. 220.

unmarried.[1] The upshot of the argument is that Ceres, scenting disaster, hides her beautiful child Proserpine in Sicily. As soon as Pluto voices his complaint, Lachesis begs him not to run the risk of waging war on Heaven. "Ask Jupiter, and a wife will be given," she pleads. Then Maia brings her son Mercury before him. Pluto, seated on his horrible but majestic throne, speaks to his winged messenger, railing against his brother Jupiter, who, he declares, not satisfied with excluding him from the light of day, has hindered him from procuring a spouse.

There were numerous models for Claudian's infernal councils in earlier poetry, such as the council of the gods in the *Aeneid* x. Nevertheless, much as Claudian owed to Virgil,[2] in the *De Raptu Proserpinae* he appears to have imitated especially the beautiful Homeric hymn to Demeter.[3] The council of the gods summoned by Jupiter, described in the Greek poem, became the infernal council in the Latin imitation, a change which had many parallels in the later history of the subject.[4]

Attention is called to the following passages from the *In Rufinum* and the *De Raptu Proserpinae* which were imitated, as we shall see, by later writers:

Invidiae quondam stimulis incanduit atrox
Alecto, placidas late cum cerneret urbes.
Protinus infernas ad limina taetra sorores,
Concilium deforme, vocat. Glomerantur in unum
Innumerae pestes Erebi, quascumque sinistro
Nox genuit fetu: Nutrix Discordia belli,
Imperiosa Fames, leto vicina Senectus
Impatiensque sui Morbus Livorque secundis
Anxius et scisso maerens velamine Luctus
Et Timor et caeco praeceps Audacia vultu
Et Luxus populator opum, quem semper adhaerens
Infelix humili gressu comitatur Egestas,
Foedaque Avaritiae complexae pectora matris
Insomnes longo veniunt examine Curae.
Complentur vario ferrata sedilia coetu
Torvaque collectis stipatur curia monstris.

[1] See T. R. Glover, *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century*, Cambridge, 1901, p. 244.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 233. [3] Vss. 313 ff.

[4] See L. Cerrato, "De Claudii Claudiani fontibus in poemate de Raptu Proserpinae," in *Rivista di Filologia*, Turin, IX (1881), 278.

Alecto stetit in mediis vulgusque tacere
Iussit et obstantes in tergum reppulit angues
Perque umeros errare dedit.[1]

At nos indecores longo torpebimus aevo
Omnibus eiectae regnis?[2]

Iam quaecumque latent ferali monstra barathro
In turmas aciemque ruunt, contraque Tonantem
Coniurant Furiae, crinitaque sontibus hydris
Tisiphone quatiens infausto lumine pinum
Armatos ad castra vocat pallentia manes.[3]

. . . . Tunc talia celso
Ore tonat—tremefacta silent dicente tyranno
Atria, latratum triplicem compescuit ingens
Ianitor et presso lacrimarum fonte resedit
Cocytos tacitisque Acheron obmutuit undis
Et Phlegethonteae requierunt murmura ripae.[4]

. . . . Tantumne tibi saevissime frater
In me iuris erit? Sic nobis noxia vires
Cum caelo Fortuna tulit? Num robur et arma
Perdidimus, si rapta dies? An forte iacentes
Ignavosque putas, quod non Cyclopia tela
Stringimus aut vacuas tonitru deludimus auras?
Nonne satis visum, quod grati luminis expers
Tertia supremae patior dispendia sortis
Informesque plagas, cum te laetissimus ornet
Signifer et vario cingant splendore Triones?[5]

II

We may consider Claudian, despite his possible familiarity with the Scriptures,[6] as the chief source of a *pagan* tradition in descriptions of infernal councils. For a *Christian* tradition, let us examine the so-called gospel of Nicodemus, which, according to Gaston Paris and Alphonse Bos, is really based on two Greek manuscripts, united

[1] *In Rufinum*, I, 25–43. I quote from *C. Claudiani Carmina*, ed. Jeep, Leipzig, 1876.
[2] *Ibid.*, 58, 59.
[3] *De Raptu Proserpinae*, I, 37–41.
[4] *Ibid.*, 83–88.
[5] *Ibid.*, 93–102.
[6] See Glover, p. 242.

by a certain Ananias or Aeneas in 425.[1] The first of these manuscripts, which is the Gospel of Nicodemus proper, is of little interest to us, being intended merely to give information on the passion of Christ supplementary to what is found in the New Testament. It is the second manuscript which contains an infernal council. This manuscript itself goes back to a manuscript of gnostic origin of the first half of the third century, the Greek form of which is anterior to the middle of the fourth century. It relates the descent of Christ into Hell, his victories over Hades and Satan, and the baptism of sinners. At considerable length an infernal council held over Christ's prospective entrance into the lower world is described. Satan tells Hades of the miracles accomplished by Christ, who comes as an all-powerful invader to take back the captives.

Probably about the end of the fifth century, the manuscript of Ananias or Aeneas was translated into Latin. The Latin translation was in turn rendered into French about the beginning of the thirteenth century by André de Coutances; also by a so-called Chrétien (first half of the thirteenth century); and by an anonymous author in the fourteenth century (MS *C* in the Paris-Bos edition). The account of the infernal council, in the French version, continues through several hundred lines.

III

At the beginning of his *Merlin*, Robert de Boron inserted an infernal council. As a result of this council, Merlin is brought into the world, born of a virgin, but, unfortunately for the devils, so innocent that he turns all his power for harm to a good purpose. In the *Merlin*, however, the time of the council is set later than in the *Nicodème*. Christ has already entered Hell; Adam, Eve, and the other captives have been released; and humanity has been safeguarded through baptism from the deceits of the evil one. The devils rehearse their grievances, such as their exclusion from Heaven, and the diminishing number of their victims, and determine to obtain their revenge by creating an anti-Christ to combat the saving doctrines of Christianity. Robert de Boron reduces the entire description of the council to three pages. Yet, despite so much abridgement,

[1] *L'Évangile de Nicodème*, ed. Paris and Bos, Paris: Société des Anciens Textes Français, 1885, pp. ii and iii.

there is often a pretty close textual resemblance between the *Merlin* and the *Nicodème*.[1]

Note in particular the following passages in the *Merlin*, which were imitated by later writers:

Qui est chis hom qui nous a enforchiés et nos ferm(et)és brisies si que nule chose que nous eussiens reposte ne pot estre celee encontre lui (et) que il n'ait fait trestout chou que il lui plaist ?[2]

Et nous alames, si presimes ichiaus qui che disoient que cil qui lors verroit en terre les deliverroit des painnes d'infer. . . . Si nous a tolu chou que nous avons perdu et chou que nous aviens saisi, que nous n'i poo(n)s riens prendre contre lui.[3]

Ore les avons tous perdus par le lavement que il font, si que nous n'avons nul pooir sour iaus dessi que il revignent (a nous) par oevres que il font.[4]

Et plus encore, que il (a) laissié menistres en terre qui les sauveront, ja n'averont tant fait de nos oevres, se il s'en voelent repentir et nos oevres guerpir et faire chou que li menistre lour diront.[5]

Cil qui plus nous ont neut, che sont cil qui (plus) di(s)ent de sa venue en terre.[6]

Il i a tel de nous qui bien puet prendre samblance d'omme et conchevoir en feme.[7]

IV

Boccaccio, in his *Filocolo*, follows on the whole the narrative of the *Cantare di Fiorio e di Biancifiore*,[8] which is probably itself derived from a French source. Nevertheless, not satisfied with what he contemptuously calls the "fabulosi parlari degli ignoranti,"[9] he undertakes to lend to the simple tale of *Fleur et Blanchefleur* a grandiose significance. To that end, he borrows heavily from classical mythology and from the Scriptures, and even attempts to impose an epic

[1] *Merlin*, ed. Paris and Ulrich, Paris, Société des Anciens Textes Français, 1886, Introduction. Cf. *Nicodème, ed. cit., loc. cit.*

[2] *Merlin*, p. 1. [4] *Ibid.* [6] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 2. [5] *Ibid.* [7] *Ibid.*

[8] Ed. Crescini, Bologna, 1889–99, Vol. I, p. 462.

[9] *Filocolo*, Vol. I (=Boccaccio, *Opere volgari*, Vol. VII), Florence, 1829, p. 7.

form upon his narrative.[1] For such an ambitious project, what better material could he find than the Biblical story of the tragic fall of o'erweening Satan, and of the creation and temptation of man? Boccaccio's predilection for scriptural matter leads him to introduce this epic narrative at least three times into the *Filocolo*. Let us call these three accounts, for convenience, A, B, and C.[2]

In A, after promising to tell the story of Florio and Biancofiore, Boccaccio suddenly relates the conflict between Jupiter and Pluto. Jupiter drove Pluto out of Heaven for his ambition, and assigned to him and to his followers the dismal kingdom of Dis. The empty seats of the fallen angels were filled with a new generation, of whom Adam and Eve were the parents. Pluto succeeded in tempting man to sin, thus driving him out of Eden "alle sue case." Jupiter then sent his son to liberate the men who were imprisoned in Dis, and also to provide them with arms so that they might defend themselves against the snares of Pluto. So effective were these weapons, that it was impossible for Pluto's forces to resist them.

At this point, the mission of St. James to Spain is suddenly introduced. Then, for a few pages, Boccaccio practically follows the *Cantare*. However, when he comes to describe Lelio's preparations for an expedition to the shrine of St. James in fulfillment of a vow, Boccaccio returns to his epic theme. He depicts Pluto as being so greatly agitated over the expedition of Lelio that he holds an infernal council over the matter. It is there decided that Pluto, disguising himself as the governor of Marmorina, is to prevent the expedition by "la paura."

In B, which is the infernal council proper, the events related in A are recited as grievances—in somewhat more summary style. There remains C, where much of the matter in A and B is recited by Ilario, as the preface to the scriptural lessons which he imparts to Florio.

Boccaccio, in narrating briefly the conspiracy of devils enraged at the victories of Christ, naturally owes little to classical sources. We may even suspect that some of his paraphernalia of proper names was taken not from Latin authors but from Dante, whom he follows

[1] See Crescini, *Contributo agli studi sul Boccaccio*, Turin, 1887, p. 200, n. 3.

[2] *Filocolo*, Vol. I, pp. 10, 11; 18, 19; Vol. II (=*Opere volgari*, Vol. VIII), pp. 309 ff.

for example in using the word Dis to refer to a city instead of to a god.[1] Boccaccio seems to have followed pretty closely the *Merlin* of Robert de Boron, or one of the Italian versions of it, such as the *Vita di Merlino* or the *Storia di Merlino* of Paolino Pieri, the former having a longer account of the conclave in Hell than the latter.[2] However, if Robert de Boron welds his epic matter fairly well with the story of a marvelous magician, Boccaccio is less successful in thrusting the same story into the history of a simple pilgrimage into Spain.

Boccaccio follows Robert de Boron in putting the infernal council after the descent of Christ into Hell and the liberation of the sinners.[3] Both versions are characterized by a recital of grievances against the Almighty, as follows:

a) The descent of Christ into Hell, and the rescue of the captives.

b) The safeguarding of the captives against further deceits and assaults of the enemy. Robert de Boron, following the *Évangile de Nicodème*, represents the captives as protected through baptism. Boccaccio, on the other hand, is anxious to give a more warlike tone to his romance. He therefore represents St. James as a knight battling for Christianity; speaks of the converts to Christianity as knights, and consistently calls their religious doctrines "armi." Of course, there was plenty of scriptural authority for these figures of speech.

c) In the *Merlin*, one of the grievances is the sending of ministers to warn men against Satan and his wiles. This feature does not occur in B, but in A Boccaccio speaks of the mission of St. James to convert the Occident.

d) In the *Merlin*, the enemy decides to work against Christ for revenge, operating through fear. In the *Filocolo*, Pluto decides to wreak his revenge by frightening Lelio and his party.

e) In the *Merlin*, the devil takes the "samblance d'homme."[4] In the *Filocolo*, Pluto takes the appearance of the governor of Marmorina. It is thus not necessary to appeal to general mediaeval

[1] Cf. *Inferno*, ed. Grandgent, Boston, 1909, Canto VIII, vs. 68, note.

[2] *Storia di Merlino*, ed. Sanesi, Bergamo, 1898, p. lxxiii.

[3] See Crescini, *Fiorio e Biancifiore*, Vol. I, p. 151.

[4] *Merlin*, p. 3.

tradition, as Crescini does, for the explanation of Pluto's supposed power to assume the shape of a man.[1]

The principal contribution of Robert de Boron to the story of a conclave in Hell was, it will be recalled, to relate events happening later than in the *Évangile de Nicodème*. The principal contribution of Boccaccio, on the other hand, was to go farther back than either the *Merlin* or the *Évangile*. To Robert de Boron's list of grievances he adds, (*a*) The expulsion of Pluto and his demons from Heaven by Jupiter; (*b*) The creation of man, to occupy the seats of the fallen angels; and he boasts of, (*c*) Tempting man to disobey his maker. Now all these items are found—in almost identical language—in A, B, and C—a fact which confirms our observation regarding Boccaccio's predilection for scriptural—or supposedly scriptural—matter.

The following extracts from B are quoted for purposes of reference:

Il miserabile re . . . . pensò di volergli ritrarre da sì fatte imprese con paura; e convocati nel suo cospetto gl' infernali ministri, disse: compagni, voi sapete che Giove non dovutamente degli alti regni i quali possede ci privò, e diecci questa strema parte sopra il centro dell' universo a possedere; e in dispetto di noi creò nuova progenia, la quale i nostri luoghi riempiesse: noi ingegnosamaute gli sottraemmo, sicchè noi volgemmo i loro passi alle nostre case: e egli ancora, non parendogli averci tanto oltraggiato, mandò il suo figliuolo a spogliarcene, al quale non possendo noi resistere ci spogliò; e dopo tutto questo fece avveduti gli abitanti della terra de' nostri lacciuoli, e donò loro armi colle quali essi leggiermente le nostre spezzano; e che noi di questi oltraggi ci abbiamo a vendicare sopra di lui. Il salire in su c'è vietato, ed egli è più possente di noi, però ci conviene, pure con ingegno, il nostro regno aumentare, e fare di riavere ciò che peraddietro abbiamo perduto.[2]

Ond' io ho proposto di volergli almeno ritrargli dell' andare gli strani templi visitando con paura.[3]

. . . . e provvide di nuova generazione volere riempiere l'abbandonate sedie. . . . .[4]

V

Sannazaro's *De Partu Virginis* (1526) is connected with the subject of the infernal council because of two passages, (*a*) David's long prophecy concerning the life of the Messiah, including his descent

[1] Crescini, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 152 ff.

[2] *Filocolo*, Vol. I, pp. 18, 19. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 19. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

into Hell and his liberation of the captives; (*b*) the address of God to the blessed in Heaven, at the beginning of Book III. The prophecy of David comes after the angel Gabriel has returned to Heaven after the Annunciation. The speech of the Father follows the account of the joyful behavior of Joseph and Mary at the birth of Jesus, and is followed by a scene in which the shepherds hear the angel chorus proclaiming that a son is given. In his speech, God recounts the triumphs of the divine will over Satan, who has attempted to usurp the throne of Heaven, and exhorts his angels to rejoice over the birth of Christ.

In the first two books of the *De Partu Virginis* Sannazaro was indebted to classical sources for little more than a few passages such as the description of the monsters in Hell, found at the close of Book I.[1] On the other hand, he was inspired to a great extent by the Scriptures, and somewhat by the *Filocolo*, which he had already imitated in his *Arcadia*.[2] The long prophecy of David regarding the life of the Messiah is no doubt modeled on the similar long medley of Biblical history recited by Ilario to Florio. The address of the Father in Book III is an imitation of the address of Pluto to his minions in the *Filocolo*, the *rôles* of the speakers being inverted, the Father reciting as triumphs what Pluto had rehearsed as grievances:

> Aetherei Proceres (neque enim ignoratis et ausus
> Infandos, dirumque acies super astra frementes)
> Si mecum iuvat antiquos ab origine motus
> Inspicere, et veterum pariter meminisse laborum:
> Quandoquidem haec vobis peperit victoria laudem:
> Huc animos, huc pacatas advertite mentes.
> Vos, quum omne arderet caelum servilibus armis,
> Arctorumque furor pertenderet impius axem
> Scandere, et in gelidos regnum transferre Triones:
> Fida manus mecum mansistis: et ultima tandem
> Experti, caelo victricia signa tulistis.[3]

The following passage from the prophecy of David is based on a collection of scriptural passages, on the plan of the long speech of Ilario in the *Filocolo:*

> Ipse catenato fessus per tartara collo
> Ducetur Pluton: tristi quem murmure circum

[1] See F. Flamini, *Il Cinquecento*, Milan, p. 106.

[2] See *Arcadia*, ed. Scherillo, Turin, 1888, pp. li–lvii.

[3] Book III, p. 76. I quote from the edition of Rome, 1877.

Inferni fractis moerebunt cornibus amnes.
At nos virgines praecincti tempora lauru,
Signa per extentos caeli victricia campos
Tollemus, laetoque Ducem clamore sequemur.
Victor io, bellator io, tu regna profunda,
Tu Manes, Erebumque, Potestatesque coërces
Aërias, Letumque tu sub Numine torques.
Ille alto temone sedens, levibusque quadrigis
Lora dabit, volucresque reget placido ore iugales,
Non iam cornipedum ductos de semine equorum.[1]

For his descriptions of scenes in Hell in Book I, however, Sannazaro imitated Claudian and Virgil.

The following description of the commotion produced among the powers of the deep by the triumphant approach of Christ is imitated freely from the *De Raptu Proserpinae:*

Intremuere Erebi sedes, obscuraque Ditis
Limina: suspirans imo de corde Megaera
Dat geminum, et torvas spectat sine mente Sorores.
Tum caudam exululans sub ventre recondidit atram
Cerberus, et sontes latratu terruit umbras:
Commotisque niger Cocytus inhorruit antris:
Et vagas Sisyphiis haeserunt saxa lacertis.[2]

The description of the monsters of the deep, which slink into their holes at the approach of Christ, is imitated closely from Virgil's account of the monsters seen by Aeneas in Hades:

. . . . diffungiant immisso lumine dirae
Eumenidum facies iactis in terga colubris.
Quas atro vix in limo Phlegethontis adustum
Accipiat nemus, et fremanti condat in ulva.
Tum variae pestes, et monstra horrentia Ditis
Ima petant: Trepident Briareïa turba,[3] Cerastae,
Semiferumque genus Centauri, et Gorgones atrae,
Scyllaeque, Sphingesque, ardentisque ore Chimaerae,
Atque Hydrae, atque Canes et terribiles Harpyiae.[4]

[1] Book I, p. 34. Cf. Psalms, 68:18; II Colossians, 5:15; I Colossians, 15:26; Revelation, 20:2 and 14.

[2] *De Partu Virginis*, I, 30. Cf. *De Raptu Proserpinae*, I, vss. 83–88, cited above, p. 171.

[3] *Briareïa turba*, from *De Raptu Proserpinae*, III, vs. 188. *Cerastae*, from *De Raptu Proserpinae*, II, vs. 346. See Lewis and Short's *Latin Dictionary*, Oxford, 1896.

[4] *De Partu Virginis*, I, 33. Cf. *Aeneid* vi. 275 ff.

The description of the monsters in the *De Partu Virginis*, as we shall see, influenced Vida, Tasso, and Milton. The following line probably also was imitated by Tasso:

. . . . liceat rumpentem cernere portas
Aëratas. . . . .[1]

VI

The action of the *Christiad* (1535) of Vida begins with the journey of Jesus to Jerusalem, in the last year of his ministry. Stopping at the house of Zaccheus, the Savior is informed by a messenger of the death of Lazarus. He departs to restore Lazarus to life, and Satan calls a council of his demons, who, alarmed by the success of Christ's mission on earth, determine to combat God by persuading the Rabbis to persecute his son. In his impassioned harangue, Satan recounts the past victories of God, who, not content with driving the rebellious angels out of Heaven, is preparing to send his son into Hell itself, to rescue the captives.

For his description of the conclave in Hell, Vida borrowed from the *Filocolo* and the *De Partu Virginis*. Vida and Boccaccio represent the chief demon's harangue as beginning with a stirring appeal to the memory of an unjust expulsion from Heaven, and of a valorous struggle against the Almighty. The following statements of grievances may be compared with the passages from the *Filocolo* quoted above.

In partemque homini nostri data regia caeli est . . . .
Nec satis: arma iterum molitur . . . .[2]
Id propter juvenem aetherea demisit ab arce . . . .
Iamque aderit, fretusque armis caelestibus ille
Sedibus exitium vehit his, et regna recludet
Infera, concessasque animas nostra eximet orbe . . . .
Irrita tentamenta, dolos et vim exiit omnem.[3]

It will be noted that Vida follows Boccaccio even in the use of the rather characteristic word "arms," which Boccaccio had substituted for the "baptism" which he had found in the *Merlin*.

[1] *De Partu Virginis*, I, 31.

[2] Here, as elsewhere, Vida seems to have been influenced by the style of Claudian. Cf. the lines *Nonne satis visum*, etc., quoted above, p. 171.

[3] *Christiad*, I, 182–202. I quote from the edition of London, 1732.

The opening lines of the speech of Satan to his followers in the *Christiad*, on the other hand, were imitated directly from a passage in the *De Partu Virginis*,[1] which was itself modeled, as we have observed, on a speech of Pluto in the *Filocolo*. The things which God, in addressing the blessed in Heaven, recounts approvingly as triumphs in the poem of Sannazaro, are included in the list of grievances found in Satan's harangue in Vida's poem. Thus Vida remodeled the verses of his predecessor, just as Claudian had transformed the divine council of Zeus to a conclave of demons in Hades.

A comparison will readily show to what an extent the speech in the *Christiad* is a counterpart of that in the *De Partu Virginis*. The Father begins with the words "Aetherei proceres"; Satan says "Tartarei proceres." Then follow parentheses, in which Vida paraphrases Sannazaro:

> Tartarei proceres, caelo gens orta sereno,
> (Quos olim huc superi mecum inclementia regis
> Aethere dejectos flagranti fulmine adegit,
> Dum regno cavet, ac sceptris multa invidus ille
> Permetuit, refugitque parem), quae praelia toto
> Egerimus caelo, quibus olim denique utrimque
> Sit certatum odiis, notum et meminisse necesse est.
> Ille astris potitur, parte et plus occupat aequa
> Aetheris, ac poenas inimica e gente recepit
> Crudeles: pro sideribus, pro luce serena
> Nobis senta situ loca, sole carentia tecta
> Reddidit. . . . .[2]

[1] The influence of Sannazaro upon Vida has been a matter of controversy. G. Moroncini (*Sulla "Cristiade" di M. G. Vida*, Trani, 1896, p. 45) is inclined to deny such an influence. Cotronei, in the *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, XXI, 364, reviewing Moroncini's book, emphasizes three resemblances between the *Christiad* and the *De Partu Virginis:* (1) The scene of the Virgin weeping at the cross; (2) The description of the Limbus; (3) The enumeration of the people who came to be recorded in the census taken under Augustus. G. Morpurgo, in a volume inaccessible to me entitled *La poesia religiosa di Iacopo Sannazaro*, Ancona, 1909, maintains that there is indisputable evidence of the imitation of Sannazaro in the *Christiad*. (See *Romanic Review*, I [1910], 450.)

E. Yardley (*Notes and Queries*, 10th series, I [1914], 249) observes that in the *Christiad*, V, there is the episode of "Fear" called forth by Satan to frighten Pilate. Have we not here the "paura" on which Pluto laid so much stress in his speech in the *Filocolo?*

[2] *Christiad*, I, 167 ff.

The following lines in the *Christiad* are imitated from the prophecy of David in the *De Partu Virginis:*

> Fors quoque nos, nisi non segnes occurrimus ipsos
> Arcta in vincla dabit, vinctosque inducet Olympo
> Victor, ovans; superi illudent toto aethere captis.[1]

For his description of the monsters of the deep, Vida has imitated Claudian, Sannazaro, and especially Virgil:

> Continuo ruit ad portas gens omnis, et adsunt
> Lucifugi coetus varia atque bicorpora monstra,
> Pube tenus hominum facies, verum hispida in anguem
> Desinit ingenti sinuata volumine cauda.
> Gorgonas hi, Sphyngasque obscoeno corpore reddunt;
> Centaurosque, Hydrasque illi, ignivomasque Chimaeras;
> Centum alii Scyllas, ac foedificas Harpyias,
> Et quae multa homines simulacra horrentia fingunt.
> At centum-geminus flammanti vertice supra est
> Arbiter ipse Erebi, centenaque brachia jactat
> Centimanus, totidemque eructat faucibus aestus
> Omnes luctificum fumumque, atrosque procaci
> Ore, oculisque ignes, et vastis naribus efflant.[2]

The first lines in this passage are imitated from the *De Raptu Proserpinae,*[3] and the names of the monsters are nearly all taken from Virgil; but the passage was probably inspired in the first place by Sannazaro, who adds "Sphinges" to the list found in the *Aeneid,* a change which Vida adopts.

VII

The infernal council in the *Gerusalemme Liberata* is found in the fourth Canto of that epic. The military operations of the Christians have been going well. Pluto, alarmed at their progress, calls a council of war in Hell, at which it is decided to send the fair Armida to work havoc among the Christians. In his harangue, Pluto relates how he and his followers have been expelled from Heaven, and how man—made of vile clay—has been put in their places. Nor was this sufficient: God sent his son, who broke the gates of Hell, and took back with him many souls.

[1] *Ibid.*, I, 190 ff. Cf. the fifth and following lines in the second passage from the *De Partu Virginis* quoted above on pp. 177 f, and the last line of the first passage.

[2] *Christiad,* I, 139 ff.

[3] See the third passage quoted above, p. 171.

For his description of the infernal council, Tasso drew upon Virgil, Claudian, Boccaccio, Sannazaro, and Vida.[1]

In the following passage, Tasso seems to be indebted not only to Vida, but also to Boccaccio:

x

E in vece del dí sereno e puro,
De l' aureo sol, de gli stellati giri,
N'ha qui rinchiusi in questo abisso oscuro;
Né vuol ch'al primo onor per noi s'aspiri:
E poscia (ahi quanto a ricordarlo è dúro!
Quest' è quel, che piú inaspra i miei martiri)
Ne' bei seggi celesti ha l'uomo chiamato,
L'uom vile e di vil fango in terra nato.

xi

Né ciò gli parve assai; ma in preda a morte,
Sol per farne piú danno, il figlio diede.
Ei venne, e ruppe le tartaree porte,
E porre osò ne' regni nostri il piede,
E trarne l'alme a noi dovute in sorte.[2]

Ne' bei seggi is here very much like Boccaccio's *abbandonate sedie*;[3] and

Né ciò gli parve assai; ma in preda a morte,
Sol per farne piú danno, il figlio diede

[1] The influence of Vida upon Tasso has been a subject of remark for the last three centuries (see Solerti, in a review of V. Vivaldi's *Sulle fonti della Gerusalemme Liberata*, *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, XXIV [1894], 257). Solerti quotes here from MS Magliabechiano II. IV. 192, cc. 305–306, where the note is made: "Nel IV, conciglio (*sic*) del diavolo, dal Vida, *Cristiade*, I, donde è tratta gran parte dell' orazione." Solerti observes that G. B. Olivi, in his *Concilium Inferorum*, is indebted to Vida and to Tasso. Rosini, in his edition of the *Gerusalemme Liberata*, has worked out in great detail the indebtedness of Tasso to Vida and to Claudian in stanzas iv–xi. Vivaldi, in *La Gerusalemme Liberata studiata nelle sue fonti*, Trani, 1907, p. 25, gives some additional resemblances between Tasso and Vida.

[2] I quote from the edition by Ferrari, Florence, 1907. Rosini hints at the indebtedness of Tasso to Boccaccio: "Questa orazione di Pluto è da conferirsi con quella del medesimo attribuitogli dal Boccaccio nel primo libro del *Filocopo*, ivi: '*Compagni, voi sapete* ec . . . . '" (Canto IV, ix, note). A similar assertion is made by F. de Sanctis, *Storia della letteratura italiana*, Bari, 1912, Vol. I, p. 285. S. Multineddu, in his *Fonti della Gerusalemme Liberata*, Turin, 1895, pp. 52 ff., denies this connection between the *Gerusalemme* and the *Filocolo*, and associates Tasso's infernal council with that in Robert de Boron's *Merlin*. Flamini, in his *Cinquecento*, p. 516, apparently accepts Multineddu's conclusions. On the other hand, Multineddu (p. 22) agrees with Guastavini, D'Ancona, and others in associating the episode of Olindo and Sofronia with the burning at the stake of Florio and Biancofiore related in Book VI of the *Filocolo*. Cf. Solerti, *op. cit.*, p. 264. Vivaldi (*op. cit.*, pp. 32, 33) denies the connection between the *Gerusalemme* and the *Merlin* on the one hand and the *Filocolo* on the other. Cf. review by Proto in *Rassegna critica della letteratura italiana*, I, 67.

[3] *Filocolo*, Vol. I, p. 10.

certainly recalls

. . . . e egli ancora, non parendogli averci tanto oltraggiato, mandò il suo figliuolo.

Furthermore, the enumeration of grievances is made more formally by Tasso than by Vida, after the style of the *Filocolo*, thus: (1) *N'ha qui rinchiusi;* (2) *E poscia;* (3) *Né ciò gli parve assai.* Both Tasso and Boccaccio have little parentheses denoting exasperation: "Quest' è quel che piú inaspra" and "non parendogli averci tanto oltraggiato."

For the opening lines of Pluto's speech, Tasso follows Vida very closely, as will appear on comparison of the following lines with those in Vida beginning "Tartarei proceres":

ix

Tartarei numi, di seder piú degni
Là sovra il sole, ond' è l'origin vostra,
Che meco già da i piú felici regni
Spinse il gran caso in questa orribil chiostra;
Gli antichi altrui sospetti e i fieri sdegni
Noti son troppo, e l'alta impresa nostra.
Or Colui regge a suo voler le stelle,
E noi siam giudicati alme rubelle.

x

Ed in vece del dí sereno e puro,
De l' aureo sol, de gli stellati giri,
N'ha qui rinchiusi in questo abisso oscuro.[1]

The imitation of Vida by Tasso amounts in some places almost to a translation. At the end of stanza xi, however, Tasso appears to have gone directly to Sannazaro for his inspiration:

Vincitor trionfando, e in nostro scherno
L'insegne ivi spiegar del vinto Inferno.

For this Sannazaro has:

. . . . et ultima tandem
Experti, caelo victricia signa tulistis

and

Signa per extentos caeli victricia campos
Tollemus, laetoque Ducem clamore sequemur.
Victor io, bellator io. . . . .[2]

[1] The passage from Vida is quoted above, p. 180.
[2] See above, pp. 177 f.

Vida has

> Arcta in vincla dabit, vinctosque Olympo
> Victor, ovans.[1]

Only Vida and Sannazaro here refer to the captivity of Satan and his demons. The display of the captured trophies of Hell, however, is mentioned solely by Sannazaro and Tasso.

For his description of the monsters of the deep, Tasso imitated Virgil, Sannazaro, and Claudian:

iv

> Tosto gli dèi d'Abisso in varie torme
> Concorron d'ogn' intorno a l' alte porte.
> Oh come strane, oh come orribil forme!
> Quant' è ne gli occhi lor terrore e morte!
> Stampano alcuni il suol di ferine orme,
> E 'n fronte umana han chiome d'angui attorte;
> E lor s'aggira dietro immensa coda,
> Che, quasi sferza, si ripiega e snoda.

v

> Qui mille immonde Arpie vedresti e mille
> Centauri e Sfingi e pallide Gorgoni;
> Molte e molte latrar voraci Scille,
> E fischiar Idre, e sibilar Pitoni,
> E vomitar Chimere atre faville,
> E Polifemi orrendi e Gerioni;
> E in nuovi mostri, e non piú intesi o visti,
> Diversi aspetti in un confusi e misti.

The first line of stanza iv is apparently imitated from the *De Raptu Proserpinae:*

> Iam quaecumque latent ferali monstra barathro
> In turmas aciemque ruunt.[2]

Sannazaro's addition of "Sphinges" to the list found in the *Aeneid* is adopted by both Vida and Tasso. Sannazaro also has "Canes," in addition to "Scyllae." Tasso mentions "Cerbero" farther on, but there he is probably imitating another passage from Claudian. On the other hand, in the *Gerusalemme Conquistata,* Tasso copies

[1] See above, p. 181.

[2] See above, p. 171.

even this detail from Sannazaro: "E latrar cani mostruosi."[1] *Gerioni*, in Tasso, indicates clearly that the author was directly imitating Virgil's "forma tricorporis umbrae."

In the *Christiad*, Briareus is depicted as the master of the deep. Tasso follows Sannazaro and Virgil, putting Polifemi (for Briareus?) on a plane with the other monsters, but in his description of Pluto is influenced by the picture of Briareus in the *Christiad*.

The description of the council of the Furies in the *In Rufinum* may have had some influence on Vida and Tasso.

Tasso probably went directly to Claudian for the following lines, although there are also close verbal resemblances with Sannazaro:

iii

Treman le spaziose atre caverne,
E l'aer cieco a quel romor rimbomba.

viii

Mentre ei parlava, Cerbero i latrati
Ripresse, e l'Idra si fe' muta al suono;
Restò Cocito, e ne tremâr gli abissi;
E in questi detti il gran rimbombo udissi.[2]

In the following lines, Tasso was doubtless imitating the *De Raptu Proserpinae* and the *In Rufinum:*

xiii

Noi trarrem neghittosi i giorni e l'ore,
Né degna cura fia che 'l cor n'accenda?

[1] V, 3. For the influence of Sannazaro upon Tasso, see Scherillo, *Arcadia, ed. cit.*, p. ccxxxvi, where the author states his belief in the connection between the *De Partu Virginis* and the *Gerusalemme Liberata*, and promises to study the matter in detail elsewhere. Vivaldi (*op. cit.*, p. 26), attempts to disprove all connection between the *Gerusalemme* and the *De Partu Virginis*, at least so far as the descriptions of the monsters of the deep is concerned. He even denies that Tasso borrowed directly from Virgil, though the contrary is shown by *Gerioni* in Tasso. He says Virgil has 'angue di Lerna' while Tasso has 'Idre,' a distinction which I fail to grasp. Also, he calls attention to the fact that Tasso and Vida have 'Sfingi,' not found in Virgil. However, it is Sannazaro who introduces "Sphinges," a proof that Vida and Tasso imitated him as well as Virgil. If 'Idre' be really different from 'angue di Lerna,' there is one more proof of the influence of Sannazaro, who also has *Hydrae*. Furthermore, while it is true that Tasso does not, like Virgil, have 'Briareo,' that monster figures not only in Sannazaro's list, but is the most important of all the monsters in the *Christiad*, which, according to Vivaldi, Tasso imitated, to the exclusion of Virgil. Vivaldi himself confesses that "cani," which is suspiciously like Sannazaro's "Canes," is found in the *Gerusalemme Conquistata*. Morpurgo, who lays great emphasis upon the influence of Sannazaro on Tasso, says that Tasso owed to him 'tutta la mossa iniziale della *Gerusalemme*' (*Romanic Review*, I, 450). For the tremendous influence of Sannazaro upon his epoch, see Torraca, *Scritti critici*, 1907, pp. 65–69. Cf. also A. Sainati, *Iacopo Sannazaro e Joachim du Bellay*, Pisa, 1915.

[2] See *De Raptu Proserpinae*, I, 83–88, quoted above on p. 171, and the passage from the *De Partu Virginis*, I, 30, quoted above on p. 178. *Rimbomba* (iii) and *rimbombo* (viii) are doubtless imitated from Vida's "antra intonuere profunda" (*op. cit.*, I, vs. 137).

The *De Raptu Proserpinae* has:

. . . . An forte iacentes
Ignavosque putas, quod non. . . . .[1]

The *In Rufinum* has:

At nos indecores longo torpebimus aevo
Omnibus eiectae regnis?[2]

For purposes of reference, stanzas xi and xv of Canto IV are quoted here:

xi

Né ciò glu parve assai; ma in preda a morte,
Sol per farne piú danno, il figlio diede.
Ei venne, e ruppe le tartaree porte,
E porre osò ne' regni nostri il piede,
E trarne l'alme a noi dovute in sorte,
E riportarne al ciel sí ricche prede,
Vincitor trïonfando, e in nostro scherno
L'insegne ivi spiegar del vinto Inferno.

xv

Ah! non fia ver; ché non sono anco estinti
Gli spirti in voi di quel valor primiero,
Quando di ferro e d'alte fiamme cinti
Pugnammo già contra il celeste impero.
Fummo, io no 'l niego, in quel conflitto vinti:
Pur non mancò virtute al gran pensiero.
Diede, che che si fosse, allor vittoria:
Rimase a noi d'invitto ardir la gloria.

VIII

Milton seems to have relished the idea of an infernal council. In *Paradise Lost*, we have the harangue of Satan to his followers in Book I; the great debate in Pandemonium, in Book II; the chorus of hisses which greeted Satan on his return to Pandemonium, in Book X. In the first book of *Paradise Regained*[3] there is also an infernal council, on much the same model as the others. Furthermore, at the age of seventeen, Milton had already described an assembling of the wicked angels by Satan, preparatory to an attack upon Britain, which alone resisted successfully the plots of the Pope.[4]

[1] See above, p. 171.
[2] See above, p. 171.
[3] Vs. 40 ff.
[4] *In Quintum Novembris.*

The opening scene of *Paradise Lost* is in Hell, where Satan attempts to rouse his comrades with the hope of regaining Heaven. In order to discuss ways and means of waging war against the Almighty, a council is held in the palace of Pandemonium. The debate which ensues occupies most of Book II. After the opening address by Satan, Moloch, Belial, and Mammon offer their opinions. Satan, in his harangue in Book I, had suggested an attack on the new world, with its newly-created inhabitants. Beelzebub, now supporting Satan, also advises an attack. Apparently no one of the angels is hardy enough to venture upon the difficult quest of the new world. Satan finally volunteers to go himself. In Book X Satan, after finding the new world, and tempting man from Eden, returns to relate his triumph. He finds that he is greeted not with applause, as before, but with hisses, because he and his followers are changed to serpents.

As a counterpart to the councils in Hell, there is a council in Heaven, in Book III. The Almighty, aware of the mission of Satan, determines to frustrate him, and tells his son of the manner in which the world is to be redeemed, through the atonement. The son of God voluntarily accepts the great destiny which is laid upon him.

For his infernal councils, as well as for the council in Heaven, Milton imitated Tasso, Vida, Sannazaro, Boccaccio, and Claudian, in addition to Aeschylus, Dante, and Marino, the author of the *Strage degli innocenti*. His indebtedness to Tasso was so striking that it claimed attention at an early date, Addison in England and Voltaire in France being among those to remark upon it. The influence of Vida upon Milton was largely exerted indirectly, through Tasso, and has usually been studied in this manner.[1] Little has been said, however, about a direct influence of Sannazaro upon Milton,[2] and, so far as I am aware, nothing at all about a direct influence of Boccaccio on the great Puritan poet. Furthermore, there are one

[1] Cf. Flamini, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

[2] Marianna Woodhull, in *The Epic of Paradise Lost*, London, 1907, p. 142, declares: "The influence of the *De Partu Virginis* can be traced also only in such minor details as the descriptive passage of the flowers that lift their heads to greet the Virgin, as they also in *Paradise Lost* welcome the coming of Eve; the larger problem of the two works is not only different, but the method is in strong contrast." Morpurgo (*op. cit.*) associates the speech of God to the blessed in Heaven, which has been quoted in part from the *De Partu Virginis*, with the harangue delivered by Satan to his demons in *Paradise Lost*, I. Also, the long prophecy of David concerning Christ, he thinks, influenced Milton's

or two little gaps in the published material on Tasso's influence on Milton,[1] long though this question has been debated.

For example, Pommrich, following the commentators, rightly associates the description of the opening of Satan's address,

> He called so loud that all the hollow deep
> Of Hell resounded![2]

with the passages in the *Gerusalemme* which we have already noted, passages which are themselves imitated from Vida, and Claudian, very likely with Sannazaro as a first inspiration. However, he might have said something about the remainder of his speech.

> . . . . Princes, Potentates,
> Warriors, the flower of Heaven, once yours, now lost,

is doubtless a direct imitation of Vida's

> Tartarei proceres, caelo gens orta sereno.[3]

The next lines are:

> If such astonishment as this can seize
> Eternal spirits: or have ye chosen this place
> After the toil of battle to repose
> Your wearied virtue, for the ease you find
> To slumber here, or in the vales of Heaven?

For these, Tasso has:

> Noi trarrem neghittosi i giorni e l'ore,
> Né degna cura fia che'l cor n'accenda?

At the same time, Milton may have consulted the original passages in Claudian, also:

> . . . . An forte iacentes,
> Ignavosque putas, quod non. . . . .

and

> At nos indecores longo torpebimus aevo
> Omnibus eiectae regnis?[4]

"demon chorus." With the first statement I am disposed to agree. The second is acceptable also, provided "demon chorus" means the hissing of the serpents in Book X. Unfortunately, I am compelled to rely upon the summary of Morpurgo's book which appeared in the *Romanic Review*, I, but so far as I am able to judge, the only trouble with Morpurgo's argument is that it does not go quite far enough.

[1] For Tasso's influence upon Milton, the reader is referred to the standard commentators, especially some of the older ones, such as Todd. Cf. E. Pommrich, *Miltons Verhältnis zu Torquato Tasso*, Leipzig dissertation, 1902.

[2] Pommrich, p. 34. *Gerusalemme Liberata*, IV, stanzas iii and viii. Cf. *Paradise Lost*, I, 314 ff.

[3] See above, p. 180.

[4] See above, p. 171.

Milton continues:

> Or in this abject posture have ye sworn
> To adore the conqueror, who now beholds
> Cherub and Seraph rolling in the flood
> With scattered arms and ensigns; till anon
> His swift pursuers from Heaven-gates discern
> The advantage, and descending, tread us down
> Thus drooping, or with linked thunderbolts
> Transfix us to this gulf?

Here there is no exact parallel in any of the poems which we have been studying. Nevertheless the *De Partu Virginis*, the *Christiad*, and the *Gerusalemme Liberata* all refer to Christ's carrying the war into Hell, and (with the exception of the last-named work) to his driving the demons from Hell.

The last words of the speech in *Paradise Lost*

> Arise, Arise, or be forever fallen!

may well have been suggested by Milton's own

> Surge, age! surge, piger . . . .

in the *In Quintum Novembris*.

Pommrich also associates the descriptions of the hissing of the serpents on the return of Satan to Pandemonium with the picture of the monsters in Hell as described by Tasso:[1]

> . . . . Dreadful was the din
> Of hissing through the hall, thick-swarming now
> With complicated monsters, head and tail,
> Scorpion, and asp, and amphisbaena dire,
> Cerastes horned, hydrus, and ellops drear,
> And dipsas (not so thick swarmed once the soil
> Bedropt with blood of Gorgon, or the isle
> Ophiusa); but still greatest he the midst,
> Now dragon grown, larger than whom the sun
> Engendered in the Pythian vale on slime,
> Huge Python.

However, "complicated monsters" seems an imitation of Vida's "bicorpora monstra"[2] rather than of anything in Tasso. Furthermore,

[1] Pommrich, p. 36. See *Paradise Lost*, X, 521 ff.

[2] See also, p. 181. Another imitation of Vida by Milton is noted by Yardley in the third fragment of the Armada epic, where Milton's "Terror" is patterned on the familiar "Fear" of Vida and Boccaccio.

"Cerastes," mentioned neither by Tasso nor by Vida, is found in the *De Partu Virginis.*

The passage quoted from *Paradise Lost* is usually explained as an imitation of Pliny, who gives the names of most of the serpents here mentioned. In view of his other imitations, direct or indirect, of Sannazaro, it seems likely that Milton here, as frequently happened, first got his general idea from Italian authors, then filled in the details from his wonderful knowledge of classical literature.

The fact should especially be borne in mind that Satan's address to the demons in Book X, which immediately precedes the description of the serpents, is in a sense a replica, after achievement of his harangues of complaint in Books I and II. Naturally there is some repetition of the old phraseology, and it is therefore the more likely that Milton consulted here the same Italian authors as at the beginning of the epic. This conclusion is confirmed by the observation of Ingleby that in the preceding book of *Paradise Lost* there is a soliloquy of Satan which is also patterned on the infernal council described in the *Gerusalemme Liberata:*[1]

> . . . . or to spite us more—
> Determined to advance into our room
> A creature formed of earth, and him endow
> Exalted from so base original,
> With Heavenly spoils, our spoils.

This is clearly related to stanzas x and xi in Tasso's account of the council:

> x
>
> Ne' bei seggi ha l'uom chiamato,
> L'uom vile, e di vil fango in terra nato,
>
> xi
>
> E riportarne al ciel sì ricche prede,
> Vincitor trionfando, e in nostro scherno
> L'insengne ivi spiegar del vinto Inferno.

In a speech of Christ in Book III of *Paradise Lost* the imitation of the second passage quoted from the *Gerusalemme Liberata,* and more especially of a passage in the *De Partu Virginis,* is very marked.

[1] *Paradise Lost,* IX, 147 ff. Cf. *Gerusalemme Liberata,* IV, stanzas x, xi. See H. Ingleby, in *Notes and Queries,* 10th series, I, 203.

The Milton commentators have here generally been satisfied to refer to the scriptural verses from which Milton's lines are ultimately drawn, without regard to the language of the Italian poets which undoubtedly was Milton's first inspiration:

> But I shall rise victorious, and subdue
> My vanquisher, spoiled of his vaunted spoil.
> Death his death's wound shall then receive, and stoop
> Inglorious, of his mortal sting disarmed;
> I through the ample air in triumph high
> Shall lead Hell captive maugre Hell, and show
> The powers of Darkness bound. Thou, at the sight
> Pleased, out of Heaven shalt look down and smile,
> While, by thee raised, I ruin all my foes,
> Death last, and with his carcase glut my grave;
> Then, with the multitude of my redeemed,
> Shall enter Heaven, long absent, and return.[1]

If we compare this passage with one quoted from the prophecy of David in the *De Partu Virginis*,[2] we shall find the following resemblances:

> Ipse catenato fessus per tartara collo
> Ducetur Pluton. . . . .

> Shall lead Hell captive maugre Hell, and show
> The powers of Darkness bound.

> . . . . laetoque Ducem clamore sequemur[3]
> . . . . Thou, at the sight
> Pleased . . . .

> Victor io, bellator io . . . .

> But I shall rise victorious . . . .

> . . . . tu regna profunda,
> Tu Manes, Erebumque, Potestatesque coërces
> Aërias, Letumque tu sub Numine torques.

> . . . . I ruin all my foes,
> Death last, and with his carcase glut the grave.

[1] *Paradise Lost*, III, 250 ff.

[2] See above, p. 177.

[3] Cf. *Christiad*, I, vs. 192: Superi illudent toto aethere captis, etc.

Ille alto temone sedens, levibusque quadrigis
Lora dabit, volucresque reget placido ore iugales,

Non iam cornipedum ductos de semine equorum.

I through the ample air in triumph high
Shall lead . . . .

Though both Vida and Tasso here imitated Sannazaro, two features, the conquest of Death, and the triumphant ride of the Savior through the air, are common to Sannazaro and Milton alone. For the last two lines quoted from Milton,

Then with the multitude of my redeemed
Shall enter Heaven. . . . .

parallels in Sannazaro, Vida, and Tasso are numerous, and need not be cited now. What is probable is that Milton got his first pattern from Sannazaro and others, then remodeled their language to make it conform still more closely to that of the Scriptures. In fact, the whole idea of representing the Father and the Son as speaking virtually the exact language of the Scriptures throughout the *Paradise Lost*, while obvious enough, may possibly have been first suggested to Milton by his reading of Italian authors.

It is also more than likely that Milton was influenced by Sannazaro in the long prophecy of future events, down to the second coming of Christ, which the angel Gabriel delivers to Adam in Books XI and XII of *Paradise Lost*, in view of the fact that the prophecy of David concerning the life of Christ, in the *De Partu Virginis*, is of somewhat similar style and of about the same length. It is likely, too, Milton had in mind the summary of the Old and New Testaments which Ilario delivered to Florio in Book V of the *Filocolo*. Florio listens to Ilario with much the same rapt attention that Adam shows to Michael.

Milton also imitated Boccaccio, consciously or unconsciously, in another respect. When he resumed work on his masterpiece, eighteen years after his return from Italy, it was Milton's purpose to begin with what is now Book III, where Satan, already escaped from Hell, finds himself in the Universe, and makes his beautiful apostrophe to the Sun.[1] Later Milton not only introduced an infernal

[1] D. Masson, *The Life of John Milton*, London, 1877, Vol. V, pp. 406, 407.

council into his *Paradise Lost* which was patterned ultimately, if not directly, on the one in the *Filocolo;* but, as in the case of the *Filocolo,* it was by means of this infernal council that the transformation of *Paradise Lost* to the epic form was accomplished.

Of course Milton's familiarity not only with what he calls the "lofty fables" of the Middle Ages, but also with the "romances" of that period, is beyond dispute.[1] That Milton had some of the old "romances" in mind when he penned Book I of *Paradise Lost* is proved by the lines of the poem itself.[2]

To summarize: the pagan suggestion of the infernal council appears in Claudian; the Christian tradition begins with the Gospel of Nicodemus. From the French version of this Gospel, Robert de Boron drew the condensed account in the *Merlin.* Boccaccio was undoubtedly influenced by the *Merlin,* which he probably knew in one of the extant Italian versions. The infernal council in the *Filocolo* directly influenced those in Vida's *Christiad* and Tasso's *Gerusalemme Liberata,* as well as the address of the Father in Heaven in Sannazaro's *De Partu Virginis.* Vida and Tasso also borrowed from Claudian's *De Raptu Proserpinae* and from Sannazaro's *De Partu Virginis.* Milton's *Paradise Lost* harks back to Tasso and to Vida, especially in Books I and II. Indirectly Milton was frequently influenced by Sannazaro, and directly in several places. In Books XI and XII Milton may also have been influenced by the long prophecy of David in the *De Partu Virginis,* probably also by the long discourse of Ilario in the *Filocolo.*

OLIN H. MOORE

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

[1] See *Prose Works,* London, 1901, Vol. III, p. 118 (*An Apology for Smectymnuus*).

[2] See *Paradise Lost,* I, 580 ff.

POE'S EXTENSION OF HIS THEORY OF THE TALE

The discussion of narrative technique contained in Poe's review of Hawthorne (1842) has been correctly signalized as establishing in America—with a solidarity for which there seems to be no counterpart in European literatures—a doctrine of the short story. The constant implication, however, that the 1842 statement stands by itself, complete and without antecedent, should not pass unchallenged. There occur in Poe's works various foreshadowings of the theory, and certain ramifications, which are worthy of mention. I do not refer to the parallel theory of the brief poem, already clearly presented in 1836, for the relationship in this case has been repeatedly indicated; I have in mind certain remarks which directly concern prose fiction. In part these demonstrate merely that the principles of the Hawthorne review had been formulated a number of years previously; in part—and this weighs more heavily in the scale—they have some interpretative value.

The idea of unity of effect, the heart of the 1842 statement, already finds expression, and is already applied to fiction, as early as 1835, when Poe writes of Lady Dacre's *Winifred, Countess of Nithsdale:*

> The absolute conclusion of this tale speaks volumes for the artist-like skill of the fair authoress. An every day writer would have ended a story of continued sorrow and suffering, with a bright gleam of unalloyed happiness, and sunshine—thus destroying at a single blow that indispensable unity which has been rightly called the unity of effect, and throwing down, as it were, in a paragraph what, perhaps, an entire volume has been laboring to establish.[1]

Comparison proves the identity of this principle with that described the following year in the brief-poem criticism mentioned above, in which the author speaks of "what is rightly termed by Schlegel, 'the *unity or totality of interest.*'"[2] It is evident in this second case that Poe had been reading Black's translation of August William Schlegel's

[1] *Works* (New York, Crowell, 1902), VIII, 74–75. Here and elsewhere the somewhat unusual punctuation of the original text is reproduced.

[2] VIII, 126.

Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature, published in Philadelphia in 1833,[1] and that the reference is to certain remarks in the chapter on the French classical drama.[2] Presumably this is also the source of the 1835 comment; if so, Poe's theory of fiction is related to Schlegel directly, and does not depend, as has been supposed,[3] upon an intermediate brief-poem doctrine.

Schlegel in turn, we may note in passing, relates his idea to "*De la Motte,* a French author, who wrote against the whole of the unities."[4] The reference is evidently to the *Premier Discours sur la Tragédie* by Houdar de la Motte.[5] Certain sentences in this *Discours* offer a parallel to the most frequently quoted paragraph of Poe's 1842 declaration. La Motte discusses the application of his theory of unity as follows:

> Mais en quoi consiste l'art de cette unité dont je parle? c'est, si je ne me trompe, à savoir dès le commencement d'une Pièce, indiquer à l'esprit et au cœur, l'objet principal dont on veut occuper l'un et émouvoir l'autre. . . . Ensuite à n'employer de personnages que ceux qui augmentent ce danger ou qui le partagent avec le Héros; à occuper toujours le Spectateur de ce seul intérêt, de manière qu'il soit présent dans chaque Scène, et qu'on ne s'y permette aucun discours, qui sous prétexte d'ornement, puisse distraire l'esprit de cet objet; et enfin à marcher ainsi jusq'au dénoûment.[6]

And Poe writes:

> A skilful literary artist has constructed a tale. If wise, he has not fashioned his thoughts to accommodate his incidents; but having conceived, with deliberate care, a certain unique or single *effect* to be wrought out, he then invents such incidents—he then combines such events as may best aid him in establishing this preconceived effect. If his very initial sentence tend not to the outbringing of this effect, then he has failed in his first step. In the whole composition there should be no word written, of which the tendency, direct or indirect, is not to the one pre-established design.[7]

But the American nowhere makes any allusion to the French author; and he seems equally unaware of the considerable body of *Novelle* criticism produced by the Schlegel brothers.

[1] As to Poe's familiarity with this translation, cf. Woodberry, *Life of Poe* (Boston, 1909), I, 179–80.

[2] Pp. 189–90. Schlegel's expression, in the original text, is "Einheit des Interesse."

[3] Cf. Baldwin, *American Short Stories* (New York, 1909), Introduction, p. 22.

[4] *Ed. cit.,* p. 189.

[5] *Œuvres,* 1754, IV, 37–46.

[6] P. 45.

[7] XI, 108.

In 1836, in a review of *Sketches by Boz*, special unity is again discussed, with reference to fiction, together with two other principles —the fallacy of sustained effort, and the desirability of a single, uninterrupted presentation of a story—which with it constitute the three essentials of the ultimate formula:[1]

> We cannot bring ourselves to believe that less actual ability is required in the composition of a really good "brief article" than in a fashionable novel of the usual dimensions. The novel certainly requires what is denominated a sustained effort—but that is a matter of mere perseverance, and has but a collateral relation to talent. On the other hand—unity of effect, a quality not easily appreciated or indeed comprehended by an ordinary mind, and a *desideratum* difficult of attainment even by those who can conceive it—is indispensable in the "brief article," and not so in the common novel. The latter, if admired at all, is admired for its detached passages, without reference to the work as a whole—or without reference to any general design—which, if it even exist in some measure, will be found to have occupied but little of the writer's attention, and cannot, from the length of the narrative, be taken in at one view, by the reader.[2]

Six years earlier, therefore, than the 1842 declaration its chief features are already thought out.

During the intervening period, however, Poe varies in the interpretation of one essential of his theory. In the same year in which he alleges that the average novel cannot, from its extent, be regarded as a whole, he points out the peculiar unity of effect of Bulwer's *Last Days of Pompeii:* "This justly admired work owes what it possesses of attraction for the mass, to the stupendousness of its leading event . . . . to the skill with which the mind of the reader is prepared for this event."[3] In 1837 he praises, in a review of a novel, the "exceeding ingenuity and finish in the adaptation of its component parts" and adds that "nothing is wanting to a complete whole, and nothing is out of place, or out of time."[4] And in 1841 he condemns the absence of special unity in *Barnaby Rudge*, affirming

[1] I disregard one point of the final statement, namely the contention, generally accepted as an axiom in American criticism, that prose and not verse is the proper vehicle for brief fiction.

[2] IX, 46. Poe applies the term "brief article" without discrimination to such pieces as *The Black Veil*, which has genuine plot, and *The Pawnbroker's Shop*, which has none. This fusion of what Dickens himself afterwards separates into Scenes, Characters, and Tales (cf. the preface to the 1850 edition) is interesting in the light of current opinion as to the interrelation of these forms (cf. Canby, *The Short Story in English* [New York, 1909], pp. 180–82). Elsewhere (XI, 110), Poe uses "article" as synonymous with "tale."

[3] IX, 153.

[4] IX, 265.

that Dickens has not properly persisted in developing only "the soul of the plot" and that he has shown "no positive genius for adaptation."[1] Perhaps Poe does not choose to regard these as typical examples of extended fiction; in that case the inconsistency vanishes, for the initial (1836) criticism is applied only—although with no particular stress upon this point—to the "common novel." Be that as it may, here are three instances[2] where the critic measures a long story by his special standard. This tendency of Poe's to extend his narrative principle to all fiction has not, I believe, been sufficiently recognized.

A fourth instance includes a qualification which leads back toward the original attitude, but the conception remains less narrow. Poe writes of Bulwer's *Night and Morning* that the author has been so careful in "this working-up of his story—in this nice dovetailing of its constituent parts—that it is difficult to detect a blemish in any portion." Yet he holds that the tension has been too great, that the author has tried too hard, since "narratives, even one-fourth as long . . . . are *essentially* inadapted to that nice and complex adjustment of incident at which he has made this desperate attempt."[3] In thus reverting Poe takes the standpoint of the practical. Sustained effort (which according to the earlier statement required only perseverance) is disapproved because it is so difficult as frequently to be out of reach of both writer and reader.

Why this is so was precisely explained, in 1841, in the following remarks, on the nature of plot—remarks which, in so far as they reveal the mechanics of totality of effect, supplement to some purpose the 1842 doctrine:

> The word *plot*, as commonly accepted, conveys but an indefinite meaning. Most persons think of it as a simple *complexity;* and into this error even so fine a critic as Augustus William Schlegel has obviously fallen, when he confounds its idea with that of the mere *intrigue* in which the Spanish dramas of Cervantes and Calderon abound. But the greatest involution of incident will not result in plot; which, properly defined, is *that in which no*

[1] XI, 57, 64.

[2] Cf. also the criticism of *Winifred* (see above, p. 195).

[3] X, 119–22. Poe continues, making the point already suggested in 1836 about the desirability of presentation at a single sitting. He here speaks of "unity or totality of effect," meaning what he means in the 1836 brief-poem statement by "*unity or totality of interest.*"

part can be displaced without ruin to the whole. It may be described as a building so dependently constructed, that to change the position of a single brick is to overthrow the entire fabric. In this definition and description, we of course refer only to that infinite perfection which the true artist bears ever in mind—that unattainable goal to which his eyes are always directed, but of the possibility of attaining which he still endeavors, if wise, to cheat himself into the belief. The reading world, however, is satisfied with a less rigid construction of the term. It is content to think that plot a good one, in which none of the leading incidents can be *removed* without *detriment* to the mass. Here indeed is a material difference; and in this view of the case the plot of "Night and Morning" is decidedly excellent. Speaking comparatively, and in regard to stories similarly composed, it is one of the best.[1]

The interest of plot, referring, as it does, to cultivated thought in the reader, and appealing to considerations analogous with those which are the essence of the sculptural taste, is by no means a popular interest; although it has the peculiarity of being appreciated in its atoms by all, while in its totality of beauty it is comprehended but by the few. . . . . A good tale may be written without it. Some of the finest fictions in the world have neglected it altogether. We see nothing of it in "Gil Blas," in the "Pilgrim's Progress," or in "Robinson Crusoe." Thus it is not an essential in story-telling at all; although, well managed, within proper limits, it is a thing to be desired.[2]

The proper limits, he here contends, would normally be those of the brief tale.[3] But in general the assertion is not so sweeping as the earlier one, and it is to be observed that in the comment on perfection of plot Poe is speaking of fiction as a whole and not exclusively of the short story.

In the perpetually emphasized 1842 review the critic focuses his attention, it is evident, upon the special problem of the brief tale. One month after the Hawthorne criticism, however, its chief principle is again extended to the novel when Poe says of Bulwer's *Zanoni* that "the necessity of preserving the oneness and entireness of effect, of which we have spoken so much, exists in peculiar force in a highly imaginative work like this."[4] In 1844 the nature of plot is discussed

[1] X, 116–17. [2] X, 120–21.

[3] Poe here states that the brief tale is "a species of composition which admits of the highest development of artistical power in alliance with the wildest vigour of imagination" (X, 122). Cf. the remark in the 1842 statement: "We have always regarded the Tale . . . . as affording the best prose opportunity for display of the highest talent" (XI, 102).

[4] XI, 120. In 1844 Poe, after enumerating the good qualities of Fouqué's *Undine*, refers to "the high artistical ability with which all are combined into a well-kept, well-*motivirt* whole of absolute unity of effect" (XVI, 50).

in its most general terms, and once more in application to all fiction, as follows:

The pleasure which we derive from any exertion of human ingenuity, is in the direct ratio of the *approach* to this species of reciprocity between cause and effect. In the construction of *plot*, for example, in fictitious literature, we should aim at so arranging the points, or incidents, that we cannot distinctly see, in respect to any one of them, whether that one depends from any other, or upholds it. In this sense, of course, perfection of plot is unattainable *in fact*—because Man is the constructor. The plots of God are perfect. The Universe is a Plot of God.[1]

The attainable in fact is mentioned briefly a year later in a discussion of the drama,[2] to which also Poe applies his theory.

It is manifest that plot, as he views it, is absolutely and singly essential to totality of effect, and that plot in this sense is by no means the monopoly of the brief tale. These are the outstanding features in the miscellaneous remarks, too often neglected, which complete the 1842 pronouncement.

Certain other bits of criticism are of interest because they suggest points generally accredited to other theorists. One of these anticipates Spielhagen. When Poe writes, in 1849, that "in the tale proper . . . . there is no space for development of character,"[3] he emphasizes a condition which the German critic, several decades later, declares the prime requisite for the *Novelle*.[4] In a discussion of *Barnaby Rudge*, Poe applies the dramatic unities to fiction, as Professor Matthews has since done[5] in the case of the short story.

The effect of the present narrative might have been materially increased by confining the action within the limits of London. The "Notre Dame" of Hugo affords a fine example of the force which can be gained by concentration, or unity of place. The unity of time is also sadly neglected, to no purpose.[6]

[1] XVI, 10. These remarks are reproduced in *Eureka* (XVI, 292; cf. XVI, 306).

[2] XIII, 44–45. Cf. the remarks on plot published in 1845 in *A Chapter of Suggestions* (XIV, 188–89). Here Poe reiterates points already made.

[3] XVI, 171. Poe adds, reverting in some degree to the 1842 view, that in the tale "mere construction is, of course, far more imperatively demanded than in the novel."

[4] *Beiträge zur Theorie und Technik des Romans* (Leipzig, 1883), p. 245. Cf. two articles in *Modern Language Notes:* "Edgar Allan Poe and Friedrich Spielhagen. Their Theory of the Short Story," March, 1910; "Poe and Spielhagen; Novelle and Short-Story," February, 1914. In the first Professor Cobb maintains that Spielhagen accepted and exploited in Germany Poe's theory of the story; in the second Professor Mitchell very justly refutes this view. Neither refers to the remark of Poe here quoted.

[5] *The Philosophy of the Short-Story* (New York, 1912), pp. 15–16.

[6] XI, 59.

In the same review he remarks upon what has since become one of the most frequently used devices of the short-story adept, the deliberate and repeated insertion of forward-pointing remarks destined to emphasize the singleness of effect. Dickens, he believes, should have employed it:

> The raven, too, intensely amusing as it is, might have been made, more than we now see it, a portion of the conception of the fantastic Barnaby. Its croakings might have been *prophetically* heard in the course of the drama. Its character might have performed, in regard to that of the idiot, much the same part as does, in music, the accompaniment in respect to the air. Each might have been distinct. Each might have differed remarkably from the other. Yet between them there might have been wrought an analogical resemblance, and although each might have existed apart, they might have formed together a whole which would have been imperfect in the absence of either.[1]

And here once more is the principle of totality of effect applied not to the brief tale but to the novel.[2]

This frequent extension of the doctrine constitutes a fresh piece of evidence as to the interplay of influences between the short and long fiction forms. Investigation of the genesis of modern brief narrative has repeatedly shown instances where the gap between the two forms has been bridged, in actual practice, by tales that approach the short story, or the *Novelle*, or the *conte* and *nouvelle*, but remain "long short-stories" or condensed novels.[3] Contemporary criticism, in the early stages, rarely sensed the relationship. But Poe is explicit. A statement by which he may very possibly have been influenced appears in the preface (1832) of William Godwin's *Caleb Williams:*

> I felt that I had a great advantage in thus carrying back my invention from the ultimate conclusion to the first commencement of the train of

[1] XI, 63.

[2] One other item suggestive of another theorist may be listed. Poe writes of a novel: "The general plot or narrative is a mere thread upon which the after-dinner anecdotes . . . . are strung with about as much method . . . . as we see urchins employ in stringing the kernels of nuts" (XI, 92). No doubt the figure has been imagined, in this application, a thousand times, but it is of interest that the same principle is applied with the same illustration by Marmontel in his pioneer definition of the *conte* (although Marmontel objects to this characteristic specifically in the *conte* and not in the *roman*). Cf. *Nouveau Dictionnaire pour servir de supplément aux dictionnaires des sciences*, etc. (Paris, 1776), II, 569. Poe refers several times to Marmontel (IV, 193; XII, 223; XIV, 46), but not to his article on the *conte*.

[3] Cf. Canby, *The Short Story* (New York, 1902), p. 21; Mitchell, *Heyse and His Predecessors in the Theory of the Novelle* (Frankfurt, 1915), p. 30; Smith, "Balzac and the Short-Story," *Modern Philology*, XII (December, 1914), 84.

adventures upon which I purposed to employ my pen. An entire unity of plot would be the infallible result; and the unity of spirit and interest in a tale truly considered gives it a powerful hold on the reader which can scarcely be generated with equal success in any other way.[1]

Poe expresses his approval of *Caleb Williams*,[2] and commends the American novel, *George Balcombe*, for being planned in a similar manner.[3]

The consequences of such a conception of totality of effect may be far-reaching. Has there not been since Poe—I would not suggest any direct influence—a tendency to apply to novel construction his special standard of unity? Consider such artists as James, Bourget, Dostoevski, such novels as *The American, Le Démon de midi, Crime and Punishment.* In each of these books attention is focused, somewhat sharply, upon a single narrative idea. James explains the conception of *The American* as follows:

I recall that I was seated in an American "horse-car" when I found myself, of a sudden, considering with enthusiasm, as the theme of a "story," the situation, in another country and an aristocratic society, of some robust but insidiously beguiled and betrayed, some cruelly wronged, compatriot: the point being in especial that he should suffer at the hands of persons pretending to represent the highest possible civilisation and to be of an order in every way superior to his own. What would he "do" in that predicament, how would he right himself, or how, failing a remedy, would he conduct himself under his wrong? This would be the question involved, and I remember well how, having entered the horse-car without a dream of it, I was presently to leave that vehicle in full possession of my answer. He would behave in the most interesting manner—it would all depend on that: stricken, smarting, sore, he would arrive at his just vindication and then would fail of all triumphantly and all vulgarly enjoying it. He would hold his revenge and cherish it and feel its sweetness, and then in the very act of forcing it home would sacrifice it in disgust. He would let them go, in short, his haughty contemners, even while feeling them, with joy, in his power, and he would obey, in so doing, one of the large and easy impulses *generally* characteristic of his type.[4]

[1] I quote from the edition of London, Routledge, 1903.

[2] XI, 64; XIV, 193.

[3] IX, 265. Balzac, a pioneer in modern French brief narrative as well as in other fields, is enthusiastic in his praise of the unity of *Caleb Williams* (*Annette et le criminel* [Paris, 1824], I, 15–16; this preface is reprinted by Lovenjoul, *Histoire des œuvres de Balzac*, 450–53).

[4] *Novels and Tales of Henry James* (New York edition), II, Preface, vi–vii.

Bourget writes, more succinctly, of *Le Démon de midi:*

> J'entrevis comme un thème possible à un roman d'analyse, cette douloureuse dualité: de hautes certitudes religieuses coexistant, chez un homme public, avec les pires égarements de la passion.[1]

Neither man ever forgets the business at hand; each unfolds the results of one situation and then stops.[2] A parallel recently drawn between Dostoevski's titanic work and a famous short story emphasizes the same structural characteristic. Professor Knowlton, in an article on *A Russian Influence on Stevenson*, affirms:

> Stevenson's *Markheim* is a Dostoevski's *Crime and Punishment* on a greatly reduced scale, a cameo version of a colossal frieze. Both are stories beginning with the murder of a pawnbroker and ending, after an experience of highly crowded mental life, with the self-surrender of the murderer to the police. When we compare the short story and the novel, we perceive at once the literary relationship between the two in method and in theme.[3]

Examples of this procedure among modern novelists might be multiplied. These men could hardly be aware of the scattered criticisms of Poe, who would be represented for them, at most, by his 1842 review; yet his theory sharply foreshadows their practice.

HORATIO E. SMITH

YALE UNIVERSITY

[1] *Le Démon de midi* (Paris, 1914), Dédicace, iii.

[2] Concerning the method of Henry James, cf. the N. Y. *Nation*, April 15, 1917, p. 398. As to the distinction which, in spite of the similarity between these long and short stories, remains, cf. the remark by James himself, in the Preface to *Roderick Hudson* (N. Y. edition, p. vi).

[3] *Modern Philology*, XIV (December, 1916), 65. De Vogüé writes of this novel in a similar vein, adding that the method is essentially Western (*Le Roman russe*, Paris, 1886, p. 247).

LAURENCE STERNE AND THÉOPHILE GAUTIER[1]

It is needless to demonstrate that Théophile Gautier was thoroughly familiar with *Tristram Shandy* and its clergyman author, for numerous references to incidents in that production are scattered throughout his collected works. It is almost as evident to anyone familiar with Gautier why "Pauvre Théo," as he so frequently styled himself, was attracted to the eccentric English divine. First of all, Gautier was steeped in Rabelais,[2] that unavowed inspirer of Sterne, and, according to Maxime du Camp,[3] could quote entire chapters from him. With Sterne, he possessed an inbred hatred for the commonplace and took keen delight in scandalizing the unsuspecting bourgeois, now by the extravagant demonstration at the *première d'Hernani*, now by the impertinent *Mlle de Maupin*. Finally, in falling under the spell of *Tristram*, Gautier was merely following the example of Xavier de Maistre, Nodier,[4] Hugo, de Vigny, Balzac, and other lesser romanticists who had read and admired him.

The influence of Sterne manifests itself very early in Gautier's works. *Albertus*, published in 1833, when the poet was but twenty-two years old, contains a rather maladroit versification of the famous passage in *Tristram Shandy*[5] relative to the tear that the Recording Angel lets fall to blot out from his records an oath of simple Uncle Toby.

> Il était ainsi fait—singulière nature!
> Son âme, qu'il niait, cependant était pure;
> —Il voulait le néant et n'aurait rien gagné
> A la suppression de l'enfer.—Homme étrange!
> Il avait les vertus qu'il riait, et l'ange

[1] Professor Charles Sears Baldwin treated briefly this subject in his article, "The Literary Influence of Sterne in France," in the *Modern Language Publications*, XVII, 2.

[2] Traces of Rabelaisian influence may also be observed intermingled with that of Sterne, especially in *Les Jeunes-France*. I have purposely avoided such passages and confined myself to those which seem to me to have been inspired by Poor Yorick. It is significant to note in this connection that almost every volume of Gautier's in which a reflection of Sterne's style may be detected contains references to incidents in *Tristram Shandy* and snatches of phrases almost literally translated from that production.

[3] *Théophile Gautier* (Paris: Hachette, 1905), p. 20.

[4] Cf. the author's article, "Sterne and Nodier," in *Modern Philology*, August, 1916.

[5] *Tristram Shandy*, Vol. VI, chap. viii.

Qui là-haut sur son livre écrivait indigné
Une grosse hérésie, un sophisme damnable,
Venant à l'action, le trouvait moins coupable,
Et pesant dans sa main le bien avec le mal,
Pour cette fois encor retenait l'anathème.
—Une larme tombée à l'endroit du blasphème
L'effaçait du feuillet fatal.[1]

The imitation in this case is certainly deliberate, as the incident is awkwardly arranged and gives the impression of having been dragged into the poem without rhyme or reason.

Gautier seems to have been greatly impressed by this passage, for he almost surely had it in mind when he wrote later, in *Mlle de Maupin:*

J'ai dans une urne de cristal quelques larmes que j'ai recueillies au moment où elles allaient tomber. Voilà mon écrin et mes diamants, et je les présenterai à l'ange qui me viendra prendre pour m'emmener à Dieu.[2]

This is not the only evidence in *Albertus* of Gautier's fondness for Sterne. The poet assumes in several instances that flippant attitude toward the reader which is so frequent with Sterne and which we shall have further occasion to note in Gautier's subsequent works. The concluding lines of the poem are typical:

J'aurais pu clairement expliquer chaque chose,
Clouer à chaque mot une savante glose.—
Je vous crois, cher lecteur, assez spirituel
Pour me comprendre.—Ainsi, bon soir. Fermez la porte,
Donnez-moi la pincette, et dites qu'on m'apporte
Un tome de *Pantagruel*.[3]

The Shandean influence is much more pronounced in *Les Jeunes-France,* which appeared also in 1833. This amusing satire directed against the extravagances committed in the name of romanticism is a sustained imitation of the haphazard, digressive, and pert manner of Tristram. "Mon digne ami," exclaims Roderick in the first episode, paraphrasing Sterne, "je ne sais pas à quoi ton père et ta mère pensaient en te faisant, mais certainement ils pensaient à autre chose."[4]

[1] *Poésies complètes* (Paris: Charpentier, 1905), I, 160.

[2] *Mlle de Maupin* (Paris: Charpentier, 1904), p. 173. Another and longer elaboration of this same theme will be found in the seventeenth scene of *Une Larme du Diable.*

[3] *Poésies complètes,* I, 184.

[4] Cf. *Tristram Shandy,* Vol. I, chap. 1.

Whatever may have occupied the minds of the worthy couple in question, Théophile was certainly thinking of Tristram, and to the eccentricities of Tristram he continually reverts from the first page of his bizarre preface, "which saves the reader from perusing three or four more or less fantastic tales," to the last story of the collection, in which he treats us to a digression of seven or eight pages just to prove to us that he really can write a good description. In the intervening pages he has used nearly all of Sterne's idiosyncrasies of style. There are frequent comments on the author's treatment of the various episodes. He tells us why this incident has been arranged in dialogue; that a fine dissertation might conveniently be introduced at a given point in his story; that he could have done this or that thing had he so desired; and that material which he has previously discarded would now be of great service to him in accounting for a certain page that he has been racking his brains to fill. Or perhaps he grows weary and intimates that he must rest his lips, "qui depuis trois cents pages se tordent en ricanements sardoniques." Frequently he bullies or mystifies the reader. Your opinion of this tale is not favorable? "Prenez-la ou laissez-la, je me couperais la gorge plutôt que de mentir d'une syllabe." You are wondering how he is going to extricate himself from an awkward predicament? "Voilà une superbe explication, à laquelle vous ne vous attendiez guère, garde nationale de lecteur que vous êtes." You blush already as you foresee a rather delicate situation. Gautier escorts you from the room to spare you an embarrassing scene. You are deeply interested in a discussion that has been started. All very well. But Gautier has tired of it and bids you continue it with Rodolphe if you so desire. These vagaries of style and others of a similar nature indicate rather clearly that the "rosse qui le sert de Pégase" bears a striking resemblance to Tristram's hobbyhorse.

There are also in *Les Jeunes-France* several cases of deliberate borrowing, two of which may be mentioned. The first of these appropriations is from the Widow Wadman's courtship of Uncle Toby, the episode in which the widow almost brings about Toby's downfall by allowing her hand to rest lightly against his as they study together the map of the Flanders' campaign.[1] This incident is

[1] *Ibid.*, Vol. VII, chap. xvi.

developed at some length in "Celle-ci et celle-là,"[1] but the adaptation is too long and too licentious to be quoted here. In the same sketch Gautier records a dialogue without explanatory comment, "laissant à l'intelligence exercée de mes lectrices le soin de deviner quelles circonstances ont donné lieu aux demandes et aux réponses."[2] This is merely the converse of the procedure employed by Sterne in the twentieth chapter of the eighth volume of *Tristram*.

In the "Contes humoristiques,"[3] in addition to further oddities of style and an exposition of the elder Shandy's theory of given names,[4] we encounter a new phase of Sterne's influence in certain lyric and sentimental passages that are almost unique in Gautier and smack strongly of the *Sentimental Journey*. Who other than poor Maria of Moulines could have inspired such an effusion as the following?

> Pardonne, ô Maria! je n'ai pu, jusqu'à présent, faire le voyage; mais j'irai, je chercherai la place; pour la découvrir j'interrogerai les inscriptions de toutes les croix, et quand je l'aurai trouvée, je me mettrai à genou, je prierai longtemps, afin que ton ombre soit consolée; je jetterai sur la pierre, verte de mousse, tant de guirlandes blanches et de fleurs d'oranger, que ta fosse semblera une corbeille de mariage.[5]

And who could find tears to shed over the fate of a poor cricket,[6] if he had not first felt the touching appeal of Toby's observation to the fly, "The world is big enough for thee and me."[7] It may be added that an allusion to this incident in *Tristram* precludes any doubt as to the source of this passage. Vaguely reminiscent also of Sterne are several poetic reveries on the irrevocable flight of time.[8]

This aspect of Sterne's genius seems, however, to have interested Gautier but little, as I have found but one other trace of sentimentality of this sort in his writings. This occurs in *Le Capitaine Fracasse*, where, in the account of Sigognac's parting from his cat and dog, there is much ado about a blessed tear falling from weeping eye.[9]

[1] Cf. *Les Jeunes-France* (Paris: Charpentier, s.d.), pp. 135 ff.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 145 ff.

[3] Published separately in various periodicals from 1831 to 1844. They appear under the title cited at the end of *Les Jeunes-France* in the edition of 1873 and in all subsequent editions.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 346–47. Cf. *Tristram Shandy*, Vol. I, chap. xix.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 277.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 289.

[7] Cf. *Tristram Shandy*, Vol. VI, chap. vii.

[8] *Les Jeunes-France*, pp. 277, 279, 306. Cf. *Tristram Shandy*, Vol. IX, chap. viii.

[9] *Le Capitaine Fracasse* (Paris: Charpentier, 1905), I, 72–73. Variations of the same incident recur several times in the novel.

Gautier has left us many narratives of his travels. One of the earliest and least known of these journeys, "Le Tour en Belgique,"[1] is decidedly reminiscent of Yorick's wanderings. Nothing could be more haphazard than this jaunt into Belgium and the incidents and opinions that the author jots down for our edification. The minor happenings incidental to the departure are chronicled in order until the writer falls asleep and leaves us to fill in the resulting gap to suit our own fancies. The places that he visits are treated in rather summary fashion, but no occasion is lost to tell us about a demented beggar woman whom he meets, the trouble that he encounters in getting a cup of coffee or a glass of beer, and the enjoyment that a performance of *Polichinelle* affords him. Now he stops his tale to call our attention to the progress that he has made; now he sets apart a chapter to explain his antipathy for railroads. One digression follows another, the climax being reached in a long paragraph that begins "A propos de chiens," and ends with a comment on windmills involving Raphael. There is no borrowing of incident in this amusing narrative, but the method is certainly that of Yorick. "Pochades, zigzags et paradoxes"[2] are in much the same vein, except that they contain few if any of the Shandean mannerisms. Only the digressive style and the trivialness of many of the incidents recall Sterne.

This completes the list of Gautier's works in which there is a sustained effort to imitate the style of *Tristram*. But there is one trick of Sterne's that the French novelist has made his own and that he uses with more or less frequency in much of his prose fiction. This is his practice of intruding himself into his stories, of stopping his tale to banter the reader or to point out that the hero is a personage of his own creation, whose destinies he controls and with whom he may take such liberties as he pleases. It would take too long to cite all of these interruptions, but three or four may be mentioned.

The sixteenth scene of *Une Larme du Diable*[3] furnishes a striking example. The play is suspended without warning, and Gautier in person proceeds in this manner: "Je vous avouerai que voici bien longtemps que je fais parler les autres et que je serais fort aise de

[1] In *Caprices et zigzags* (Paris: Charpentier, s.d.).

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Théâtre* (Paris: Charpentier, 1877), pp. 46–48.

trouver jour à placer convenablement mon petit mot." This "petit mot" consists of a somewhat lengthy interpretation of the significance of the play and an appeal for the reader's indulgence in judging the remaining scenes. This said, the author retires from the stage and the play goes on. Sterne's dedicatory epistle inserted in the middle of the first volume of *Tristram Shandy* is not more pleasingly *mal à propos.*

In *Mlle de Maupin* we note among other asides this piece of flippancy: "Le lecteur en pensera ce qu'il voudra; ce sont de simples conjectures que nous lui proposons; nous n'en savons pas là-dessus plus que lui . . . "[1] etc.

The *Nouvelles* are rich in similar *boutades,* especially *Fortunio,* in at least ten chapters of which Gautier deems it necessary to suspend his narrative to chat with the reader or to make a complacent remark about his skill or lack of skill in handling the intrigue. The last four pages of the twelfth chapter should be read in this connection. The following shorter passage from the fifth chapter is however quite as typical.

Musidora is disappointed in finding no information concerning Fortunio in a certain portfolio belonging to him that has fallen into her hands:

> Musidora est assurément fort contrariée, mais nous le sommes bien autant qu'elle. Nous comptions beaucoup sur le portefeuille pour donner à nos lecteurs (qu'on nous pardonne cet amour-propre) des renseignements exacts sur ce problématique personnage. Nous espérions qu'il y aurait dans ce portefeuille des lettres d'amour, des plans de tragédies, des romans en deux volumes et autres, ou tout au moins des cartes de visite, ainsi que cela doit être dans le portefeuille de tout héros un peu bien situé. Notre embarras est cruel. . . .

It suddenly occurs to Gautier that he might choose another hero.

> Nous avons bien envie de le laisser là. Si nous prenions George à sa place?
>
> Bah! Il a l'abominable habitude de se griser matin et soir et quelquefois dans la journée, et aussi un peu dans la nuit. Que diriez-vous, Madame, d'un héros qui serait toujours ivre, et qui parlerait deux heures sur la différence de l'aile droite et de l'aile gauche de la perdrix?
>
> —Et Alfred?
>
> —Il est trop bête.
>
> —Et de Marcilly?
>
> —Il ne l'est pas assez.

[1] *Op. cit.,* p. 62.

Nous garderons donc Fortunio faute de mieux: les premières nouvelles que nous en aurons, nous vous les ferons savoir aussitôt.—Entrons donc dans la salle de bain de Musidora.[1]

Even from this cursory survey of Sterne's influence upon Gautier it is evident that it was not the sentimentality nor even the humor of Sterne that appealed to the French novelist, but his surprising and original style. This observation in itself suffices to explain why Gautier was drawn to imitate deliberately the English humorist. Gautier was above all an artist, interested in the form rather than in the subject-matter of literature. An eager student of the various forms of literary expression, he frequently in his gropings to perfect his own style reverted to authors of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and essayed to reproduce their manners. *Jean et Jeannette*,[2] for instance, is a sympathetic and successful rendering in short-story form of *Le Jeu de l'amour et du hasard*, with much of the grace and delicate humor that we associate with Marivaux. *Le Capitaine Fracasse* is essentially an evocation of seventeenth-century life, as seen through the eyes of Scarron. And *Le petit chien de la Marquise* is, in the novelist's own words, an attempt "de donner l'idée d'un style et d'une manière tout à fait tombés dans l'oubli."[3] Here then lies the explanation of Gautier's dallying with Sterne. *Tristram* suggested to him an experiment in literary expression and aroused in him the desire to see what effects he could produce with instruments that Sterne had used with such marked success. He experimented therefore with this alluring but artificial style, and when he had exhausted its possibilities for him he passed on to something else.

How important is the influence of Sterne upon Gautier? Should it be considered seriously in any estimate of his works? Gautier remarks a propos of one of his digressions in *Fortunio* that the passage may seem to some of his readers to be a hors d'oeuvre and that he is entirely of that opinion.[4] If we except *Les Jeunes-France*, which adds little or nothing to its author's reputation, we may borrow

[1] *Nouvelles* (Paris: Charpentier, 1904), pp. 45–48.

[2] In *Un Trio de Romans* (Paris: Charpentier, 1888).

[3] *Nouvelles*, p. 251. It is significant to note that *Le petit chien de la Marquise* was first published in 1836; that is, during the period when Gautier was experimenting with Sterne.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 251. This aside upon the value of digressions is a reminiscence of a similar observation in *Tristram Shandy*, Vol. I, chap. xxii.

Gautier's own term to express the literary importance of those portions of his stories that Sterne may have inspired. They are hors d'oeuvre—nothing more. Interesting and diverting they assuredly are, but the great majority of them might readily be eliminated without detriment to the productions in which they occur. The qualities upon which Gautier's fame rests lie elsewhere and no one of them can be said to have been acquired or even perfected by his study of Laurence Sterne.

F. B. Barton

University of Minnesota

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Elizabethan Translations from the Italian. By Mary Augusta Scott. Vassar Semi-Centennial Series. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1916. Pp. lxxxi+558.

Miss Scott's bibliography, *Elizabethan Translations from the Italian*, is a reprint of the articles contributed by her to *Publications of the Modern Language Association* from 1895 to 1899, supplemented by a large number of new items, with an introduction on the Italian Renaissance in England, and a copious index. This completion of the labor of many years in the field furnishes students of Elizabethan literature a valuable reference work. Many out-of-the-way items have been gathered, and, as far as the data are complete, the bibliographical and literary details as well as the titles seem to be given with accuracy.

Because of some very serious gaps, however, it is difficult to accord the volume the praise that much of the work deserves. Though according to Miss Scott "all sources of information are given in the notes" (p. xv), many important articles and books of recent years dealing with phases of the Italian influence are not mentioned. Often an old work is cited instead of a more recent and authoritative one, while references to the research journals are rare. The omissions resulting from this failure to follow the literature of the field are often serious.

But to my mind the most inexplicable hiatus in the work is the failure to include Wyatt and Surrey's poems or Tottel's *Miscellany*. The omission is not due to the exclusion of writers belonging to the period preceding Elizabeth's reign, for Lydgate's *Troy Book*, published in 1555, heads the section called "Metrical Romances" on account of its relation to Guido delle Colonne. How completely the real pioneers of the Italian movement are passed over by Miss Scott is seen in a statement in the Introduction (p. xl): "The Italian literary conquest of England during the sixteenth century was led by the story-tellers and poets, first made known to the Elizabethans mainly through William Painter's *The Palace of Pleasure* (1566–67) and Thomas Watson's *Passionate Centurie of Love* (1582)." The appearance of Spenser's translations from Petrarch in *The Theatre of Voluptuous Worldlings*, 1569, is noted only under the *Complaints*, 1591. Howell's "Certain Verses translated out of Petrark, concerning Rome, written by him many yeares since," found in *Devises*, 1580, is not included in Miss Scott's list.

Another unfortunate omission concerns works of Aretine and Machiavelli that should be included under the section "Italian and Latin Publications in England," particularly as Aretine, whose ill name and fame permeate Elizabethan literature, is not treated in the record of Italian influence. Some years ago, in an article in *Modern Language Notes* (XXII, 2–6, 129–35) entitled "All of the Five Fictitious Italian Editions of Writings of Machiavelli and Three of Those of Pietro Aretino Printed by John Wolfe of London (1584–1588)," Gerber presented evidence showing that works of both writers found publication in England. But, aside from the definite evidence of the Stationers' Register quoted by Gerber, Miss Scott had sufficient reason to investigate Wolfe's activities, for she herself quotes Cockle's surmise (pp. 306–7, from *A Bibliography of English Military Books*, p. 135) that an Italian edition of Machiavelli's *Art of War* with the legend "Palermo, A. Antonelli, 1587" was "probably printed secretly in London by John Wolfe before 28 Jan. 1584." It is quite clear, however, that, though Miss Scott quotes from the Register in certain instances, its valuable evidence has not been systematically used.

A bibliography of so broad scope might also have included such items as Gascoigne's translation of *Hemetes the Heremite* into Italian, and *Palestina*, "Written by Mr. R[obert]. C[hambers]. P. and Bachelor of Diuinitie. *B. Sermartelli, Florence.* [*London?*] 1600" (cf. Esdaile, *English Tales and Romances*, pp. 77, 35).

For the madrigal collections Miss Scott seems to have relied largely on Oliphant's *La Musa Madrigalesca*, while Bolle's *Die gedruckten englischen Liederbücher bis 1600* (*Palaestra*, XXIX), 1903, was apparently unknown to her. Bolle points out that No. XXIX of Byrd's *Psalms, sonets, and songs of sadness and pietie*, 1587—the first of the madrigal collections, but omitted by Miss Scott—is from Orlando di Lasso. Several other collections not listed by her are shown by Bolle to have borrowed from earlier collections which drew from Italian sources. For her items numbered 88, 95, 96, 97, 99, and 105, Miss Scott might have found in Bolle's book details as to Italian sources of individual madrigals, supplementing or correcting those taken by her from Oliphant or older writers. Naturally, also, in listing the modern reprints of the madrigal collections she fails to indicate the fact that Bolle reprinted a number of those earlier than 1600, particularly such madrigals or collections as were not already accessible in modern reprints. Thus Miss Scott merely refers to *The British Bibliographer*, I, 344–45, for a few of the songs in Morley's *Canzonets*, 1597, but the entire collection is reprinted by Bolle. For Thomas Watson's *The first sett of Italian Madrigalls Englished*, 1590, Miss Scott prints a few scattering madrigals, chiefly from Oliphant. Both F. I. Carpenter, however, in the *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* (II, 321–58), and Bolle (pp. 41 ff.) print all of these madrigals and their Italian originals.

The section "Romances in Prose" I have compared, by no means exhaustively, with Esdaile's *English Tales and Romances*, 1912. There are many cases in which Esdaile gives bibliographical details supplementing Miss Scott's of which she is unaware or which she ignores without explanation. For example, for Miss Scott's No. 6, *The Historie of Aurelio and of Isabell;* 9, Boccaccio's *Philocopo;* 36, *The Cobler of Caunterburie;* 50, *The Honour of Chivalrie;* 55, *Patient Grisel;* 62, *Decameron;* and 69, *The Fortunate, the Deceived, and the Unfortunate Lovers*, Esdaile lists English editions or versions that are not noticed by Miss Scott. In the case of *The Forrest of Fancy* (No. 24), Esdaile conjectures that the two supposedly distinct editions of 1579 are really one. *Foure Straunge, lamentable, and Tragicall Hystories* (No. 21) by R.S., Esdaile assigns to Robert Smyth, and the anonymous *Hipolito and Isabella* (No. 64) to Alexander Hart. So far as I have noted, however, no work of Esdaile's list for which Italian sources have been pointed out is omitted by Miss Scott. Some works she has included merely because their Italian color or setting suggests Italian influences, and the following additional titles which may reflect Italian sources are recorded by Esdaile: *The strange aduentour of two Italian Knights*, entered on the Stationers' Register 19 April, 1577; Antony Munday, *Zelauto . . . . Containing a Delicate Disputation, gallantly discoursed betweene two noble Gentlemen of Italye*, 1580; Henry Roberts, *A Defiance to Fortune . . . . Whereunto is adioyned the honorable Warres of Galastino, Duke of Millaine*, 1590; J.S., *Clidamas, or the Sicilian Tale*, entered on the Register 25 February, 1636/7. On the other hand, Miss Scott's list contains several works not mentioned by Esdaile. Those important for prose fiction, if their existence is established, are the lost *Life of Sir Meliado* (No. 15); *Tarletons Tragical Treatises* (No. 23); and *The Tragicall historie of Romeus and Iuliet* (No. 31). Some other differences in the lists of the two bibliographers are evidently due to difference in classification, and variation is to be expected here in view of the many hybrid types in Elizabethan fiction.

The one fixed type of fiction, however, as far as the Italian influence is concerned, was the novella, and one feels that Miss Scott's classification should take into account the distinctness of the type. Most of the works of pure fiction included in *Elizabethan Translations from the Italian* are drawn from novelle. The metrical romances of the Middle Ages, indeed, were so entirely discredited among the cultured, to whom Italian literature appealed chiefly, that Miss Scott's heading "Metrical Romances" for the section dealing with verse tales seems ill chosen. Further, the sections of the book should have been so arranged that the prose would follow immediately on the verse tales. Most of the translations of Boccaccio and Bandello were rendered in verse at first, no doubt on account of the classical leanings of the age, which found in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* the model for story-telling. During the period of uncertainty in regard to the correct basis for English

meter, prose gained the ascendency, particularly in collections of novelle translated from Italian prose. Turbervile's *Tragical Tales* is all in verse, but a little later Pettie's collection of classical tales was given prose form. The transition is seen in the use of both verse and prose for two of the collections grouped by Miss Scott under "Romances in Prose": Whetstone's *Rock of Regard*, 1576, and Gifford's *Posie of Gilloflowers*, 1580. *Tarletons Tragical Treatises* (No. 23), 1578, unknown to me, is according to the title "both in Prose and Verse." Whetstone's *Heptameron of Ciuill Discourses*, 1582, has poems interspersed with the prose tales.

Another important phase of the influence of the novella—one in which Miss Scott's work shows at its best—is represented by the lists of plays drawn from the various Elizabethan collections of tales. The lists, however, are scattered, and the cross-references insufficient. The titles of all plays drawn from the translations of Italian novelle should, I think, be assembled at the end of the section devoted to plays with direct Italian sources.

I add from my own random studies in the field a few further comments on "Romances in Prose," following Miss Scott's system of numbers.

8. Painter's *Palace of Pleasure*.—Painter's derivation of Bandello's stories from the French version of the *Histoires Tragiques* is not indicated. All Italian sources for Painter's stories should be given in order that the treatment be consistent with that of other collections discussed. Miss Scott has substituted her list of plays drawn from Painter's stories.

10. Fenton's *Tragicall Discourses*.—Discourse I is not "a translation of Ilicino's celebrated *novella*" but of the Belleforest translation of Bandello's version. Ford in *The Broken Heart* seems to have been indebted to the second discourse, the story of Livio and Camilla. Cf. *Modern Language Notes*, XXVIII, 51–52.

19. *A Petite Pallace of Pettie his pleasure*.—Miss Scott, though she pronounces all the stories classical, includes this collection apparently because Cephalus and Procris are "both of the Duke of Venice's court." It is possible, however, that the vogue of the first story, "Sinorix and Camma," in England for more than a decade was due to its appearance in *The Courtier*, translated by Hoby in 1561 (edition of Raleigh, pp. 236–37). In 1569/70 the story was twice entered on the Stationers' Register as a ballad, first as a "ballett intituled *sinorex Cania et Sinatus*" and second as a "ballett intituled *the Revenge yat a Woman of Grece toke of hym that slewe hyr husbounde*" (Arber's *Transcript*, I, 414, 416). Probably one of these forms appears in the ballad-like version "A straunge historie" in Gifford's *Posie of Gilloflowers* (Grosart, *Occasional Issues*, I, 128–31).

25. Gifford's *Posie of Gilloflowers*.—The difficulty sometimes encountered of determining direct Italian influence is illustrated here. Gifford's use of Italian names and his references to Italian sources indicate a strong influence of Italy. In some cases, however, it is possible that he drew his material

from ballad, farce, or jest-book, adding an Italian color because of the vogue of the Italianate. The ballad origin of "A straunge historie" has just been suggested. Miss Scott cites from the jest-books parallels to "Maister Gasparinus," and the story finds a further parallel in Ayrer's "Von etlichen närrischen Reden des Claus Narrn," etc., a work possibly derived from an English jig. A late jest-book version of "The Florentines and the Citizens of Bergamaske" and two variants of a related tale from tradition are given in *The Folk-Lore Record* (II, 173–76, and III, 127–29). "Of one that hyred a foolish seruant" is the same story as the first part of Ayrer's "Der engelendische Jann Posset," which is again probably an English jig revamped; cf. Bolte, *Singspiele der Englischen Komödianten*, p. 14, for parallels in jest-book and farce. Gifford's "A merry iest" is a version of the widespread story of a scholar journeying to paradise, found in Ayrer's singspiel "Der Forster im Schmaltzkübel"; cf. Bolte, p. 15, and *Folk Fellows Communications*.

27. *Rich his Farewell to Militarie Profession.*—There are a number of minor errors in the list of plays drawn from this collection. *Laelia* is not included among the parallels to the "Apolonius and Silla" story. Reference to "three Italian *Inganni* comedies" is misleading, as one of the three bears the title *Gl'Ingannati*. There is no mention of Shirley's use of "Philotus and Emilia" in *Love Tricks* (cf. *Modern Language Notes*, XXIV, 100–101). The Scotch play *Philotus*, ascribed here to David Lyndsay, was in all probability written long after Sir David Lyndsay's death in 1555. *The Devil is an Ass* was printed in 1631, not 1641, though it was bound into the Folio completed in 1641.

28. Rich's *Don Simonides.*—This work is included because Warton believed that he had seen an Italian original. Becker has traced the plan of the book and part of the plot to Contreras, *Silva de aventuras* (cf. "'The Adventure of Don Simonides,' ein Roman von Barnabe Rich und seine Quelle" in Herrig's *Archiv*, 131, 64–80). A story which according to Becker's division is worked into the third part is related to Bandello, IV, 7.

48. Montemayor's *Diana*, translated by Yong.—No statement is made of the relation of *Diana* to Italian pastoral romance.

62. *Decameron.*—Some corrections might be made in the list of plays derived from Boccaccio's tales. I see no connection of Sharpham's *Fleire* with III, 3. John Phillip's *Patient Grissell* is omitted from the plays dealing with the Patient Grissell theme. For X, 4, Lee (*The Decameron, Its Sources and Analogues*, p. 314) lists Leigh Hunt's *The Legend of Florence*. Several jigs from Boccaccio's tales might be included. "Singing Simpkin," before 1620, is from VII, 6. From VII, 7, come "Rowlandes Godsonne," 1592, and the farce *Politick Whore; or Conceited Cuckold*, published in *The Muse of Newmarket*, 1580. The jigs, however, are little known. Miss Scott shows clearly by a remark on page 1 her failure to understand that the dramatic jig was in pure dialogue, but sung and danced as it was acted.

161. *Titus and Gisippus.*—This is not listed under "Romances in Prose," but the first translation of the story into English, by Elyot, was in prose. Goldsmith's story of Alcander and Septimius in *The Bee* is scarcely so important a variant as some Elizabethan stories. Closely related to *Titus and Gisippus* is *The notable hystory of two faithful lovers named Alfagus and Archelaus. Whearein is declared the true fygure of Amytie and Freyndshypp. . . . . Translated into English meeter,* 1574, by Edward Ienynges (cf. Corser, *Collectanea,* Part 8, pp. 303–8). Another variant, *Alexander and Lodowick,* surviving in a ballad, was dramatized for Henslowe (cf. Greg, *Henslowe's Diary,* II, 182). Lee, *Decameron,* pp. 339 f., describes a third variant, the ballad "Alphonso and Ganselo," in T. Deloney's *Garland of Goodwill.* The Titus and Gisippus story probably influenced Lyly in *Euphues* (cf. *Modern Philology,* VII, 577–85), but Miss Scott has not included *Euphues* in her bibliography.

C. R. BASKERVILL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Miscellanea Hibernica. By KUNO MEYER. University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. II, No. 4, November, 1916. Pp. 55.

Aside from Professor Cox's "Middle Irish Fragment of Bede's Ecclesiastical History" (*Studies in Honor of J. M. Hart* [New York, 1910], pp. 122–78), Rev. G. W. Hoey's *Irish Homily on the Passion* (Baltimore, 1911), and Rev. J. A. Geary's *Five Irish Homilies from the Rennes MS* (Washington, D.C., 1912), Dr. Meyer's *Miscellanea Hibernica* constitutes the most extensive body of purely linguistic Celtic material which has yet emanated from an American press.[1]

The *Miscellanea Hibernica* consists of a series of notes published by Dr. Meyer as lecturer in Celtic at the University of Illinois. Nearly half the volume (pp. 28–51) is devoted to etymological observations (Sec. VI) and to corrections and emendations in published Irish texts (Sec. VII) and in Thurneysen's *Handbuch des Altirischen* (Sec. VIII). Section VI forms a substantial addition to Dr. Meyer's already extensive contributions to our knowledge of Irish lexicography. Another important division of the brochure deals primarily with questions of meter. In Section III (pp. 14–17) the author establishes the important fact that the Old Irish spirant *th* had been completely aspirated by the tenth century. He also quotes several examples of certain rare variations on the familiar *debide* meter (pp. 15–16), edits critically a didactic poem ascribed to St. Moling (pp. 17–18), and prints

[1] Cf. J. L. Gerig, *Columbia University Quarterly* (December, 1916), pp. 41 f. "The Irish Lives of Guy of Warwick and Bevis of Hampton" (pp. 338), ed. by Professor Robinson, of Harvard, was published in Germany in the *Ztsch. f. celt. Philol.*, VI (1907).

six ancient Irish poems showing sporadic rhyme in addition to the older alliteration (pp. 18–28). One of these he regards, doubtless correctly, as "an originally pagan prayer remodelled by a Christian poet." If this surmise be correct, the document furnishes a startling illustration of the kindly attitude of the early Christian Irish toward their ancient pagan beliefs. Sections I (pp. 9–12) and II (pp. 12–14), to which attention will be drawn immediately, deal with well-known characters in Irish romantic saga.

Section I is of especial importance to those interested in Irish literature either for its own sake or for its possible relations to other European literatures. It consists of a note on Sualtaim, the putative father of the great Cuchulainn. Dr. Meyer points out that the Ulster hero, known to pagan tradition as the son of a supernatural being, Lug (perhaps a god), has been supplied with a mortal father through one of those errors "which abound in Irish as well as in Welsh genealogical tables." The name of Cuchulainn's mortal father is given variously as Soalta, Soa(i)lte, Sualtach, and Sualtaim, of which the latter, although the commonest, is the latest. Just as King Amadair Flidais evolved from a misreading of *a máthair Flidais*, "his mother (was) Flidais," and King Bran mac Febail, familiar to all readers of the *Imram Brain*, originated from a misinterpretation of the name of the promontory called Srúb Brain, "Raven's Beak," as if it were "Bran's Headland,"[1] so the name of Cuchulainn's parent appears to have arisen from a mistranslation of the adjective *soalta* applied to the young hero, as in a passage quoted by Dr. Meyer from the *Book of Leinster*, in which Leborcham, the official woman satirist of the court of Ulster, addresses Cuchulainn as *gein Loga soalta*," well-nurtured son of Lug." That Cuchulainn's earthly father owes his name to this or a similar error is rendered still more probable by the highly suspicious circumstance that in its earliest form—*Soalta*, *Soailte*—the name is uninflected, as is also the case with the later *Sualtach*, which latter "suggests the meaning 'well-jointed,' while *Sualtaim* may be looked upon as the superlative of *su-alta* [*so-alta*], the genitive having, as often in proper names, taken the place of the nominative." It is worth adding that the invention of a human father for Cuchulainn perhaps explains the fact that in the *Cóir Anmann* Sualtam is called *Sídhe*, "of the elf mound," and is supplied with a supernatural mother: an epithet originally applied to the son has been transferred to the father and the fairy mother invented to account for it.[2] Dr. Meyer also fails to note the fact that a Sualtach appears as the grandfather of Finn mac Cumaill in the *Tesmolta Cormaic*.[3]

The bearing of these observations on Irish literary history and on the science of storiology, though not touched upon by Dr. Meyer, is important. Students who use Celtic tradition for purposes of literary investigation are liable to disregard the editorial element in recorded Irish tradition, whereas

[1] Cf. *Rom. Rev.*, IX (1918), 39, n. 29.

[2] *Irische Texte*, III, 1 (1891), 407. [3] *Sil. Gad.*, I (1892), 92; II, 99.

it becomes more and more evident not only that the great mass of ancient Irish saga literature was put into its present form at a period when the events described were thought of as belonging to the remote past, but that the work was accomplished by scholarly redactors who, according to their lights, combined into new and often awkward forms much genuine folk tradition, outlined in sketchy fashion accounts whose details could be filled out according to the fancy of future narrators, unscrupulously devised stories to account for unfamiliar names, or introduced new characters to whom they attached popular motifs or tales of their own devising. With this light one has only to read such documents as the *Dinnshenchas*, the *Cóir Anmann*, and the *Acallam na Senórach* to appreciate how many Irish stories owe their local habitation, if not their very existence, to fanciful learned or semilearned etymologies.

Dr. Meyer's discovery is particularly important in connection with one of our most archaic and puzzling Irish sagas, the *Compert Conchulainn*, "Birth of Cuchulainn." Of the several extant versions of this story the most ancient linguistically occurs in the early twelfth-century *Lebor na h-Uidre*.[1] Zimmer long ago pointed out that the LU version is a clumsy redaction of at least two earlier accounts of the birth of Cuchulainn,[2] and it now seems clear that at least one of these was itself a combination of still older elements. As Zimmer noted, the portion of the LU text containing the double account of Cuchulainn's divine and his human father is derived ultimately from the *Libur Dromma Snechta*, a lost manuscript which, as Thurneysen has recently shown, probably dated from the eighth century. This confused narrative is comprehensible only as a perversion of a story told in the fifteenth-century MS *Egerton 1782* (B.M.) (*Ir. T.*, I, 143 ff.) and more satisfactorily in the fourteenth-century MS *Stowe D. 4. 2* (R.I.A.) (*CZ*, V [1905], 500 ff.). It is obvious to the student of popular literature that the version given in the Egerton and Stowe manuscripts is based on an account in which Cuchulainn was the son of King Conchobar's sister Deichtire by a supernatural being who abducts his mistress to his fairy realm and, after keeping her for three years, causes her to assume bird form and lure her brother to the other world at the time her child is to be born. In the account represented by LU this clear, simple narrative has been distorted in an unsuccessful effort to combine it with other stories attached to Cuchulainn for the purpose of explaining his extraordinary career. For example, Cuchulainn, like Conchobar himself and other heroes among relatively primitive peoples, is born as the result of his mother's swallowing a diminutive animal which sprang into her mouth from a vessel out of which she was drinking; or he is the offspring of incestuous intercourse between Deichtire and her brother. The stupid

[1] Cf. Thurneysen, *Abhandl. d. königl. Gesell. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen*, Phil.-Hist. Kl., N.F., XIV, No. 2 (1912), p. 31.

[2] Zimmer, *Ztsch. f. vergl. Sprf.*, XXVIII (1887), 423 f.

and well-nigh incomprehensible patchwork resulting from the combination of these three accounts is further complicated by the addition of the story of Cuchulainn's birth as the son of the princess and a petty Ulster chieftain named Sualtaim, who, according to an oft-quoted interpolation in the *Táin Bó Cúailnge*, lives on the Plain of Muirthemne and from whose dwelling the boy hero Setanta (Cuchulainn), like Perceval, sets forth to seek deeds of arms at his uncle's court.

The story of Cuchulainn's conception through drink is an ethnological motif which obviously embarrassed the redactor of the LU version, and the incest story[1] is suggestive of those late Greek accounts which make Perseus the son of Danaë by her uncle instead of by Zeus. Though these as well as the remaining versions of Cuchulainn's birth-story are at least as old as the eighth century and it is impossible in the present state of our knowledge to determine the exact order in which the various stories became attached to the Ulster cycle, Dr. Meyer's discovery, supported by the independent investigations of the folklorist, furnishes an indication of the relative chronology of at least two of the accounts. Whatever may be the ultimate origin of the strange figure, one of whose names (Setanta) looks so un-Goidelic, the story of his purely mortal origin is probably the latest, and that of his half-divine origin is the most satisfactory and perhaps the most ancient, which has come down to us.[2] It should, however, be emphasized that the identification of Sualtaim as a comparatively late addition to the Cuchulainn saga in no way assists the futile efforts of real or would-be mythologists to identify Cuchulainn with a supposed Gaulish divinity Esus,[3] with the sun,[4] or with an ancient cuckoo-god.[5] As Windisch has pointed out in an important dissertation,[6] the attachment to Cuchulainn of various fabulous elements, some of which render him a striking parallel to the Greek Achilles, no more tend to prove his original divinity than, *mutatis mutandis*, they do in the case, say, of Beówulf or of Arthur.

Dr. Meyer's observations, taken in connection with the fact that Welsh as well as Irish mediaeval writers fabricated genealogies and told false etymological legends, lend plausibility to a hypothesis regarding the origin of King Arthur's patronymic which was suggested as early as the beginning of the last century[7] and has been proposed several times since.[8] It is based on an

[1] Nutt's arguments for the mythical character of the trait are not convincing (*op. cit.*, II, 44 f.).

[2] Cf. Nutt's analysis, *op. cit.*, II, 43.

[3] D'Arbois de Jubainville, *RC*, XIX, 245 ff.

[4] Rhŷs, *Hib. Lects.*, p. 435.

[5] J. Pokorny, *Mitteil. d. anthrop. Gesell. in Wien*, XXXIX (1909), 89 ff.

[6] *Abhandl. d. königl. sächsisch. Gesell. d. Wiss.*, Phil.-Hist. Kl., XXIX (1912), 109, 119 ff.

[7] Cf. Joseph Ritson, *Life of King Arthur* (1825), pp. 53 ff.

[8] Cf. Fletcher, *Harvard Studies and Notes*, X (1906), 89.

interpolation in certain late manuscripts of Nennius' *Historia Britonum*, according to which Arthur was called *mab uter Britannice, filius horribilis Latine, quoniam a puericia sua crudelis fuit.* The words *mab uter* are susceptible not only of the interpretation given in the Latin gloss,[1] but also of the translation "son of Uter"—a fact which may have led Geoffrey of Monmouth or one of his predecessors to supply Nennius' lauded *dux bellorum* with a father, and to exalt the latter by applying to him the epithet Pendragon, "Head-dragon," "Head-leader," in accordance with a practice "common in Welsh poetry of calling a king or great leader a dragon."[2] Merlin is brought forward to assist the newly created Uter Pendragon in playing Jupiter to Igerna's Alcmene, and thus the father of the renowned Arthur enters the theater of mediaeval romance as the result of a linguistic perversion strikingly similar to that which gave rise to the father of the Ulster hero whose birth, training, and early exploits so closely resemble those of Hercules.[3]

The question of whether Arthur's father was invented by Geoffrey or someone else and of whether the falsification was deliberate or unintentional cannot, of course, be answered with certainty, but a twelfth-century Irish poem[4] attacking the learned, who "for the sake of pelf" confound genealogical tables, is certainly eloquent of the methods in vogue in Ireland, whose relations with Wales are so amply attested on both sides of St. George's Channel.

Dr. Meyer's second note contributes an additional bit to the already large body of evidence tending to discredit Zimmer's brilliant though often unsound arguments in favor of Germanic influences on Irish tradition. Taking up the work begun by Windisch, the author completely demolishes Zimmer's contention that Fer Diad, Cuchulainn's friend and most famous opponent in the *Táin Bó Cúailnge*, is a combination of Siegfried and a Nibelung. Fer Diad's famous *conganchness*, unlike Siegfried's horny skin, was a kind of armament, and the name signifies "Man of Smoke," not "Man of Mist," as Zimmer imagined. "It is evidently a nickname denoting perhaps a man with a smoke-colored complexion or hair, or referring to some accident at his birth, or the like." Zimmer's tendency to overestimate the classical influences on mediaeval Irish literature[5] has also been recently pointed out by Professor W. F. Thrall.[6]

TOM PEETE CROSS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[1] Cf. word *uthr* in Pughe's *Welsh Dictionary*.

[2] Rhŷs, *Celtic Brit.* (1904), p. 136; cf. *Welsh People*, p. 106.

[3] Of the name *Uther pendragon* Zimmer says, "Dies will doch . . . . weiter nichts sagen als *Uther* (=latein *Victor?*) *dux bellorum.*" *Nen. Vindic.*, p. 286, note.

[4] *Misc. Hib.*, p. 9.

[5] *Ztsch. f. d. Alt.*, XXXIII (1889), 129 ff., 257 ff.

[6] *Mod. Phil.*, XV (1917), 449 ff.

L'Année Littéraire (1754–1790) comme intermédiare en France des littératures étrangères, par P. VAN TIEGHEM. (Bibliothèque de littérature comparée.) Paris: F. Rieder et C^ie^, 1917. Pp. 162.

According to Dr. Van Tieghem, this study "est destiné à faire connaître avec quelque précision le rôle qu'a joué le journal *L'Année Littéraire* dans la diffusion en France des littératures étrangères pendant la seconde moitié du XVIII^e^ siècle. Il se compose d'un Mémoire et d'un Index analytique."

The Mémoire is a study of the general characteristics of the *Année*. The value of the journal as a literary review is stressed, and tables are given showing the relative importance of the various foreign literatures and *genres* and the rise and fall of the number of contributions concerning foreign literatures. The attitude of the *Année* toward translations is discussed at length. The Mémoire contains a chapter explaining the ideas of Fréron and his followers as to the advantages and dangers of this foreign invasion. Dr. Van Tieghem also analyzes the aesthetic theory of the *Année* and gives its judgments on the principal foreign literatures as a whole and on certain foreign authors (Shakespeare, Young, Lessing, Goethe, and others) in particular. As a whole the Mémoire constitutes a very satisfactory chapter in the history of French literature.

The Index analytique professes to give "l'indication de tous les comptes-rendus ou annonces d'ouvrages étrangers, ou traduits des langues étrangères, ou se rapportant aux littératures étrangères, à l'exception de quelques ouvrages purement scientifiques et d'un certain nombre de grammaires." The incompleteness of Dr. Van Tieghem's list is revealed by an examination of the *Année* for two important years.

For the year 1769—"l'année la plus féconde"—the *Année* contains ten notices not mentioned in Dr. Van Tieghem's list of thirty-seven.

ENGLAND

1. *Seconde lettre de M. J. Blunt à l'auteur de ces feuilles.* Blunt maintains that Barthe, author of *Les fausses infidélités*, took both *sujet* and *fond* from *The Merry Wives of Windsor*.[1] (The first letter is listed by Dr. Van Tieghem in No. 71.)

2. *Vies des Pères, des Martyrs et des autres principaux Saints.* Translated from the English (Vol. 6).[2] Summary of several of the lives. Book highly praised.

3. *Parallèle de la condition et des facultés de l'homme avec la condition et les facultés des autres animaux.* Translated from the English by Robinet.[3] (English author not named.) Man surpasses other animals through his reason, his sociability, his taste, and his religion. Each of these four is discussed in turn. The work is cited as well worth reading.

[1] *Année*, II (1769), 110–17. [2] *Année*, II (1769), 103–16. [3] *Année*, V (1769), 97–112.

4. *L'Observateur français à Londres*, Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 5.[1] Discussion of the English government.

5. *Ibid.*, Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10.[2] The English *mores*. Frequent suicides among the English, their strong sense of justice, enthusiasm for athletics. (The first volume of *L'Observateur* is noted by Dr. Van Tieghem in No. 224.)

GERMANY

6. *Essai d'une description générale des peuples policés et des peuples non-policés*. Translated from the German of M. Steebs.[3] A sketch of the history of civilization. "La raison la plus saine et la plus lumineuse a dicté cet ouvrage."

7. *Histoire de la Russie*. Translated from the German.[4] The German text is a translation of a Russian original by Lomonossow. Mildly praised.

8. *Mort de Gellert*.[5] Announcement of his death, with an appreciation of the man.

OTHER COUNTRIES

9. *Zend Avesta*. Translated into French from the original *Zend*, with remarks.[6] Announcement and short review.

10. *Kongs-Skugg-Sio, utlegd a Daunsku og Latinu, or Speculum Regale cum interpretatione Danicâ et Latinâ, variis lectionibus et notis*. Reviewed in a letter from Copenhagen.[7] This work was written by a Norwegian royal minister for the instruction of his son. It is said to date from the twelfth century. It treats of the manner of life of the business men, of the court, of the clergy, and of the peasants.

For 1784—the year of the appearance of Volumes XIX and XX of Le Tourneur's translation of Shakespeare—Dr. Van Tieghem lists ten articles. Two omissions are to be noted:

1. *Evélina*, by Miss Burney. Translated from the English.[8] Announcement only.

2. *Histoire des progrès et de la chute de la République Romaine*, by Adam Ferguson. Translated from the English.[9] Useful but not remarkable for style or breadth of view.

If these two years are a fair test of the *Index*, one must conclude that the omissions are so numerous and significant that they very seriously impair its value. It is to be regretted that Dr. Van Tieghem in this part of his study does not reach the standard set by him in his monumental *Ossian en France*.

JAMES KESSLER

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[1] *Année*, VI (1769), 314–26.
[2] *Année*, VIII (1769), 264–76.
[3] *Année*, III (1769), 3–20.
[4] *Année*, V (1769), 325–43.
[5] *Année*, VIII (1769), 350–51.
[6] *Année*, VI (1769), 91–97.
[7] *Année*, VII (1769), 346–50.
[8] *Année*, III (1784), 143.
[9] *Année*, VI (1784), 145–62.

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVI *September 1918* NUMBER 5

THE REACTION AGAINST WILLIAM GODWIN

I

In 1801 William Godwin published his *Thoughts Occasioned by the Perusal of Dr. Parr's Spital Sermon,* a pamphlet in which, with dignity and praiseworthy restraint of feeling, he undertook to reply to the numerous vehement and more or less vituperative critics, who, repelled and, in some cases, panic-stricken by his doctrines of rationalistic anarchism, had been attacking his *Political Justice* in lectures, sermons, novels, and pamphlets.[1] Preparatory to his consideration of the charges of his opponents, Godwin reviews the various phases of the reaction against him. He emphasizes the fact that upon its publication in 1793 *Political Justice* had immediately gained him such credit with people of literary and intellectual distinction that for more than four years he had listened only to the "voice of commendation."[2] But he goes on to explain that after the excesses in France had started a violent reaction against those principles of the Revolution which were held responsible for the crimes committed to the cry "Liberty and fraternity," many of his friends had gradually

[1] Of the spirit which pervades five of the best pages in Godwin's reply, Coleridge says in a marginal comment in his copy of the pamphlet in the British Museum: "They reflect great honor on Godwin's head and heart. Tho' I did it only in the zenith of his reputation, yet I feel remorse *ever* to have spoken unkindly of such a man."

[2] Hazlitt's statement is often quoted: "No work gave in our time such a blow to the philosophical mind of our country." An unknown author testifies: "In many places, perhaps some hundreds, in England and Scotland copies were bought by subscription, and read aloud in meetings of the subscribers" (*Public Characters,* London, 1799).

deserted the cause of freedom, and he, alone having remained faithful, had found himself the object of criticism, at first respectful and judicial, and later by degrees more bitterly hostile and insulting. With the attitude of two pamphlets and Malthus' *Essay upon Population,* which had appeared in 1798, Godwin has no fault to find. But he expresses keen resentment that in 1799 his former friend Sir James Mackintosh, in his public lectures upon *The Law of Nature and Nations,* had treated him "like a highwayman or an assassin," and represented him "as a wretch, who only wanted the power in order to prove himself as infernal as Robespierre." Godwin then records that the next year after Mackintosh's attack two new critics had appeared against him. Rev. Robert Hall, the distinguished Baptist divine, had warned his flock against the pernicious radicalism of the day in a famous sermon upon "Modern Infidelity" in which, in Godwin's opinion, "every notion of toleration or decorum was treated with infuriated contempt."[1] Then, in April of the same year, another of Godwin's friends, Dr. Samuel Parr, had felt himself under obligation, in a sermon before the Lord Mayor of London himself, to attempt to demolish, as perilous to the moral order, the doctrine of universal benevolence, a cornerstone of *Political Justice.* Godwin brushes aside with contempt the insults of other critics—"the vulgar contumelies of the author of the Pursuits of Literature, novels of buffoonery and scandal to the amount of half a score, and British critics, Anti-Jacobin newspapers, and Anti-Jacobin magazines without number."[2]

Godwin's account of the reaction against him is illuminating as far as it goes, but it can scarcely be regarded as complete. It is

[1] In his younger days Robert Hall, like so many others, was an ardent supporter of the cause of liberty, but after the atrocities of the Revolution he recoiled from its doctrines. This change of attitude is disclosed by a comparison of *An Apology for the Freedom of the Press* (1793), in which he took issue with Burke and extolled the rights of man, and his sermon, "Modern Infidelity." This latter address, first made in Bristol in October (1800), and repeated in Cambridge in November, created a deep impression; it attracted to the dissenting meeting-house as regular hearers both students and fellows. Mackintosh in his lectures at Lincoln's Inn, and Dr. Parr in his notes to his "Spital Sermon," quoted it with approval, and subsequently it went through many editions. In 1803 Hall returned to his attack upon Godwin in his sermon, "The Sentiments Proper to the Present Crisis." See Vol. I of *Works,* 3 vols., New York, 1832.

[2] Two pamphlets not mentioned by title in the discussion above are: W. C. Proby, *Modern Philosophy and Barbarism, or a Comparison between the Theory of Godwin and the Practice of Lycurgus,* London, 1798; and Thomas Green, *An Examination of the Leading Principles of the New System of Morals, as that Principle is Stated and Applied*

deficient in two respects. In the first place, Godwin in his analysis does not put his finger on all the causes of the hostility of which he was the victim. In the second place, he is apparently ignorant of the fact that the reaction against him had begun earlier than he indicates. It is the purpose of the first part of this paper to supply this missing information in preparation for a full discussion in the second part of the fiction written in criticism of his radicalism.

Godwin is undoubtedly correct in explaining the reaction of public opinion against him by the growing antagonism to the whole revolutionary movement felt among conservatives and those liberals who had been shocked by the course of events in France. Yet it is possible to recognize in addition more specific and personal reasons why the hostility to Godwin gradually grew more bitter. Probably he shared in the odium which the more zealous of his disciples incurred by the active promulgation of his views. John Thelwall, possessed of an ardor for propaganda of which Godwin himself repeatedly disapproved, in defiance of government opposition persisted in public lectures to disseminate revolutionary doctrine, until finally in 1795, after the government had failed to convict him of treason in 1794, he was muzzled by the Pitt and Grenville Bill against Sedition.[1] In 1796, at one of the meetings of the Royston bookclub, when the subject of discussion was the problem whether private affection was compatible with universal benevolence, Crabb Robinson defended the Godwinian point of view so warmly that two years later, when he visited Bury, he discovered that he was in ill repute, and that Rev. Robert Hall had strenuously remonstrated with a member of his church whose intention had been to entertain Robinson.[2] The result of this incident was an energetic exchange of letters between Robinson

in Mr. Godwin's Political Justice, in a Letter to a Friend, 1798 (2d ed., 1799). Here might be cited also two works by an anti-Godwinian, Robert Fellowes: *Religion without Cant: or, a Preservative against Lukewarmness and Intolerance*, London, 1801 (see pp. 307 ff., 328 ff., 392); and *A Picture of Christian Philosophy. The Fourth Edition. With a Supplement on the Culture and Practice of Benevolence*, London, 1803 (see pp. 75 ff., 297 ff.).

[1] For Thelwall's indebtedness to Godwin see, for example, the two lectures on the *Prospective Principles of Virtue*, Vol. I of *The Tribune, a Periodical Publication, Consisting Chiefly of the Political Lectures of J. Thelwall*, 3 vols., London, 1795–96. For his personal relations with Godwin see Charles Cestre, *John Thelwall*, London and New York, 1906.

[2] Crabb-Robinson, *Diary, Reminiscences, and Correspondence*, selected and edited by Thomas Sadler (2 vols., 3d ed., London and New York, 1872), I, 21.

and Hall—a correspondence which reveals the increasing alarm with which the propagation of the ideas of *Political Justice* was viewed.

Those of Godwin's disciples who revealed in one way or another any sympathy with his denunciation of marriage in favor of greater freedom in the relationship of the sexes, were especially responsible in no small degree for the popular hatred of the author of *Political Justice.* In 1796 Mary Hays, who had long been the friend and admirer of Mary Wollstonecraft, and whose reputation had, as Crabb Robinson informs us, unjustly suffered on that account, published the *Memoirs of Emma Courtney.*[1] In this novel the heroine, taking her cue from *The Rights of Woman,* deplores as a tragedy the economic dependence of her sex, and, fortified by the individualistic doctrines of *Political Justice,* upholds the right of private judgment, offers herself as mistress to the man she passionately loves, and in general suffers cruelly in her continual clashes with the conventions of a "distempered civilization." Such being the rebellious spirit of the novel, it was inevitable that in the public mind what appeared as the iniquities of Godwin and Mary Hays became associated, and that subsequent novels, designed to expose Godwinian sophistry, quoted from both *Political Justice* and *Emma Courtney.*[2]

After the death of his wife Godwin, by his publication of *The Wrongs of Woman* among the posthumous works of Mary Wollstonecraft and by the *Memoirs* in 1798, made a conscientious attempt to do her honor, but in each case his efforts were misdirected, and, ironically enough, succeeded only in intensifying the animosity against himself and in bringing Mary Wollstonecraft into greater disrepute with sternly "respectable" people. *The Wrongs of Woman* made it clear that association with him had deepened her radicalism, and that, more defiant and uncompromising in her attitude toward society than she had been in her earlier work, Mary Wollstonecraft was inclined to sympathize with his attack upon marriage. As a protest against economic conditions that permitted to women so few honorable employments and made prostitution an almost inevitable alternative, as a plea for more liberal divorce laws by which a woman

[1] See also for the influence of Mary Wollstonecraft upon Miss Hays the latter's *Letters and Essays, Moral and Miscellaneous,* London, 1793.

[2] For example, Charles Lloyd, *Edmund Oliver,* 2 vols., Bristol, 1798; Elizabeth Hamilton, *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers,* 3 vols., 1800.

might more easily free herself from a drunkard or a rake, and as a defense of the wife who, revolted by the degrading misery of life with a dissipated husband, deserts him to enter a union with a man who intellectually and morally is her equal, this vivid naturalistic novel seemed to aim a blow at the very foundations of morality. The success the same year of such a play as Kotzebue's *The Stranger*, in which an erring wife is forgiven by her husband, indicated to the popular mind a dangerous and growing sympathy with the adulteress. Ladies of impeccable propriety, like Miss Hannah More and Mrs. Jane West, indignant at such leniency and armed with the terrors of Christian charity as they interpreted it, issued warnings against the insidious connivance at viciousness, and made known what sentence *they* thought ought to be passed upon the outcast and the unfaithful wife.[1]

Moreover, as we have said, Godwin's well-intentioned biography of Mary Wollstonecraft, in which matters were given publicity that would otherwise have remained unknown, provided the unfeeling, blundering enemy with additional weapons of attack. Whereas *Caleb Williams* (1794) had impressed the public largely by virtue of its thrilling narrative, and *The Enquirer* had been received indifferently as a less vigorous statement of some of the doctrines of *Political Justice*, the *Memoirs*, with its frank, unapologetic account of Mary Wollstonecraft's relations with Imlay and Godwin, seemed an affront to decency, affording convincing proof that by ingenious sophistry the new philosophers would sanction unbridled licentiousness. In the second edition in the same year poor Godwin attempted to tone down such passages as were likely to offend the moral sensibilities of his readers, but his effort at reparation was too late. In his novel, *The Infernal Quixote*, Charles Lucas describes with sarcastic comment Godwin's *Memoirs* as the "History of the Intrigues of His Own Wife."[2] Outraged that the philosopher should have felt himself

[1] Hannah More, *Strictures on the Modern System of Female Education* (2 vols., 3d ed., London, 1799), I, 47, 48, 145; Mrs. Jane West, *Letters Addressed to a Young Man* (3 vols., London, 1801), II, 221, 225. See also the *Monthly Review*, June, 1798. The critic prefers A. Schink's version of *The Stranger*, in which the wife considers elopement, but does not actually sin. This change the translator regarded as "more consistent with moral sentiment, and more congenial to the heart of an English audience." Unfortunately for the preservation of English morality, this sanitary version was never played (see Genest).

[2] *The Infernal Quixote* (4 vols., London, 1801), I, 170.

under obligation to apologize for his indulgence in marriage, an institution of which he had made previously such unsparing criticism, Rev. Robert Hall branded Godwin's book as "a narrative of his licentious amours."[1] When former admirers of Mary Wollstonecraft read of "the errors which love should have concealed," "the idol they had worshipped" became "an image of clay."[2] Thus Godwin's effort to vindicate Mary Wollstonecraft was persistently misconstrued, and an insidious significance was seen in the fact that the authoress of such a book of passionate protest as *The Wrongs of Woman* had loved out of wedlock. Generally with little justice and sometimes with even less decency the cry was taken up by various writers and echoed in review, treatise, novel, and satiric poem.[3]

It has been shown, I think, in what respects Godwin's analysis of the causes of the reaction against him is incomplete. The chronology of his account is also not entirely satisfactory. Godwin is scarcely accurate when he asserts that "for more than four years," that is, until about 1798, *Political Justice* remained without the slightest refutation. Although he had met Coleridge at the close of 1794, perhaps he did not know that in the Bristol lectures in 1795 and in *The Watchman* in 1796 the young poet had attacked the principles of *Political Justice*. During the same period, while he was at Racedown, Dorsetshire, Wordsworth, who had for a long time been plunged into pessimism at the failure of the Godwinian philosophy, under the test of experience, to clarify his spiritual problems and to vindicate reason as an infallible guide, emerged from his doubt and self-analysis and wrote *The Borderers* as a record of his emancipation from the seducing formulas of Godwinian optimism. As far as I

[1] "Modern Infidelity," in Vol. I of *Works*, 3 vols, New York, 1832.

[2] Mary Wollstonecraft's biography in Vol. II of Mrs. Elwood's *Memoirs of the Literary Ladies of England*, 2 vols., London, 1843.

[3] John Bowles, *Reflections on the Political and Moral State of Society at the Close of the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1800), p. 134; *The Millennium, a Poem in Three Cantos* (London, 1800), I, ll. 423–40; *The Anti-Jacobin Review*, June, 1803. As late as 1817 a scurrilous book, *The Sexagenarian; or The Recollections of a Literary Life* (2 vols., London), describes (Vol. I, chap. lii) in these atrocious terms Mary Wollstonecraft's attempted suicide after Imlay's desertion: "The lady did not indeed, in imitation of Sappho, precipitate herself from another Leucadian rock; she chose a more vulgar mode of death; she put some lead into her pockets, and threw herself into the water. She did not, however, use lead enough, as there was still gas sufficient left in her head to counterpoise it. She was rescued from the watery bier, and lived again to experience the feverish varieties of the tender passion."

have been able to discover, in the considerable body of anti-Godwinian literature, *The Borderers* is the only work that has dramatic form, and Wordsworth seems to have been the first to adopt the plan of exposing the dangers of Godwinism by means of a fiction exhibiting the disastrous results of carrying the principles of *Political Justice* into practice. With *The Borderers* itself Godwin may not have been acquainted, as Wordsworth did not publish it until 1842. In 1797, as we shall see, the *Letters of a Hindoo Rajah* hilariously burlesqued cherished Godwinian ideas, and the *Anti-Jacobin* (December 18) heaped ridicule upon his conception of gratitude and marriage. These efforts, however, Godwin may not have regarded as rising to the dignity of a refutation.

The facts point to the conclusion that from 1795 the attacks upon Godwin grew more frequent and more bitter, precipitated, as they were, partly by the general reaction against the spirit of the French Revolution and partly by the excessive zeal of his disciples and the unguarded frankness of his *Memoirs* of Mary Wollstonecraft. In 1798, the year of the publication of *The Wrongs of Woman* and the *Memoirs*, there was a sudden increase of hostility, two anti-Godwinian novels and three anti-Godwinian pamphlets making their appearance. In 1799 and 1800 the antagonism was scarcely less bitter. In 1801, in his reply to Dr. Parr's "Spital Sermon," Godwin declared: "The cry spread like a general infection, and I have been told that not even a petty novel . . . . now ventures to aspire to favour, unless it contains some expression of dislike and abhorrence to the new philosophy, and its chief (or shall I say its most voluminous?) English adherent."

II

To an account of these anti-Godwinian novels, an almost forgotten page in the history of our fiction, I wish to give attention in the rest of this paper. Few of these novels are mentioned in the current manuals, yet their number—and further search would probably reveal more of them stowed away in old libraries—indicates how great was thought to be the necessity of putting out of court such revolutionary doctrines as Godwin had formulated. Obviously it is only by the accumulation of such evidence that we can interpret

justly the spirit of the age and estimate the solidarity of conservative opinion. It is noteworthy that the best of these books were rapidly disposed of, *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers* (1800) by Elizabeth Hamilton and *The Vagabond* (1799) by George Walker going through three editions within three years. In the Preface of the third edition of his work Walker, who had appropriately dedicated his book to the reactionary Lord Bishop of Llandaff, expresses the hope that the rapid sale of his anti-Godwinian novel is proof that the aristocratic classes are awakening to a sense of duty, and are encouraging by the purchase of their books the authors who write in defense of the established order. It is a shame, in Walker's opinion, that Tom Paine should have made a fortune from his inflammatory treatises. The amount of anti-Godwinian material in these different novels varies. Sometimes, as in the anonymous *Memoirs of M. de Brinboc* (1805), it is very slight indeed, introduced, one suspects, largely because it was the fashion in some quarters to bespatter the modern philosophers; more frequently it forms the very substance of the work. The mood of these novels varies also, ranging from burlesque, as in the anonymous *St. Godwin* (1800), to tragedy, as in Charles Lloyd's *Edmund Oliver* (1798) and Mrs. Opie's *Adeline Mowbray* (1804).

Their bitterly uncompromising attitude toward the doctrines of *Political Justice* is reflected by the novelists in their characterization of Godwinians. Sometimes the philosopher is represented as a well-intentioned man imposed upon by a doctrine of specious philanthropy and conscientiously undertaking to disseminate his radical ideas. Such are Lok in *Waldorf*, Glenmurray in *Adeline Mowbray*, and Arnon in *The Infernal Quixote*, all of whom come to regret bitterly the havoc they have wrought. More often the novelist represents the philosopher as a cold-blooded, calculating villain, who finds in lawless Godwinian individualism a theory of life thoroughly congenial to his unprincipled nature, and who deliberately employs the insinuating doctrines of *Political Justice* to destroy the moral scruples of his victims in order to accomplish his own vile designs. This character is a resuscitation of the Machiavellian villain of Elizabethan tragedy, the triumphant egoist, proud of his intellectual powers, contemptuous of his victims, and doing evil systematically.

Such a type is of frequent recurrence in revolutionary literature, especially in Germany, but Wordsworth is probably the first to represent the type as a propagator of Godwinism. Like Oswald, in Wordsworth's *The Borderers*, ruthlessly destroying all the finer sentiments that ennoble humanity, are Fitzosborne in Mrs. West's *A Tale of the Times* (1799), Vallaton in *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers*, Marauder in *The Infernal Quixote*, Williams in the anonymous novel *Dorothea, or A Ray of the New Light* (1801), and Denham in the anonymous *The Citizen's Daughter* (1804). Stupeo, the Pangloss of *The Vagabond*, instructs his pupil, "When we [i.e., the philosophers] have shaken off the influence of everything called principle, are satisfied we have no portion of eternity, and that the fable of an avenging Deity is an old woman's tale, what power, I ask, can control us? We become almost too great for the world, mind seems to rise superior to matter, crime becomes nothing; all that men call murder, incest, lust, and cruelty, are trifling." . . . . "I feel," cries Frederick, "I feel I am now free. I shall render my name immortal, for no human tie, no moral check shall stay the purpose of my power."[1]

When the novelists undertake to exhibit the Godwinian system in operation in actual life, they represent it, according as their mood is satiric or serious, as responsible for the most ludicrous situations or utter misery. Space forbidding the discussion of all the ideas the sophistry of which is thus exposed, we can give our attention to the treatment of only the most significant of these conceptions.

Fundamental in the structure of *Political Justice* is the idea, derived from Helvetius, that man is the product of his education, that is, the sum total of all the influences that play upon him from the very moment of birth. This theory of environment, responsible for much of Godwin's antagonism to any form of government as one of the most evil and most powerful of the forces molding human character, was burlesqued with Aristophanic extravagance by Elizabeth Hamilton. Bridgetina Botherim, a squint-eyed Godwinian, explains that she imbibed a "love of literature and an importunate sensibility" from the milk of her foster-nurse, a village girl who at

[1] Vol. II, chap. iv. Walker's attacks upon Godwin occurred *after* he had slavishly copied the plot of *Caleb Williams* in his own novel *Theodore Cyphon* (1796). Certainly a Godwinian conception of gratitude! With Stupeo's *credo* compare that of Marauder in *The Infernal Quixote*, II, 297, 298.

the time was being taught to read by the parish clerk in Muddy Lane. In the "fifth grand era" of her life she acquired her passion for metaphysics.

> My mother got a packet of brown snuff from London by the mail-coach; it was wrapped in two proof-sheets of the quarto-edition of the Political Justice. I eagerly snatched up the paper, and notwithstanding the frequent fits of sneezing it occasioned, from the quantity of snuff contained in every fold, I greedily devoured its contents. I read and sneezed, and sneezed and read, till the germ of philosophy began to fructify my soul. From that moment I became a philosopher and need not inform you of the important consequences.[1]

In *Letters of a Hindoo Rajah*, also by Elizabeth Hamilton, Mr. Sceptic raises his fellow-philosophers to a high pitch of excitement by expressing his conviction that, by altering their environment, sparrows might be changed to honeybees. As Miss Ardent remarks, "According to the arguments of the young philosopher, I see no reason why, by a proper course of education, a monkey may not be a Minister of State, or a goose Lord Chancellor of England." The philosophers enthusiastically determine to put Mr. Sceptic's theory to immediate trial. They catch three hundred sparrows, build a huge hive, and put the birds therein. At dawn Sir Caprice hastens to the hive in his night robe to find out if the sparrows have begun to hum. Hark! he hears a buzz. He listens. No! It is a solitary bee in a shrub near by. When the philosophers discover that the sparrows have flown away, they conclude that the birds have swarmed on some neighboring tree and may be fixed in their abode by a beating of pans. Hope is rekindled. The next morning, undaunted by a pouring rain, the philosophers sally forth with tin pans and beat them violently beneath a tree on which they have spied a few sparrows. But the birds are obdurate and refuse to swarm. "The master of the bees declared he had never seen a swarm so unmanageable."[2]

We should not, however, allow such a satire, excellent as it is, to blind us to the fact that it was just such impregnable optimism that inspired much of the social idealism of the revolutionary era and encouraged faith in human regeneration. Men of common sense who

[1] *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers* (3d ed., 1801), II, 83 ff.

[2] II, 158 ff.

had read their Rousseau and Helvetius tried to carry these theories into practice. Thomas Day, Richard Edgeworth, and John Thelwall experimented with the education of children. So sincerely did Crabb Robinson and Bentham admire Helvetius that, as young men, they thought of entering his service as servants.[1]

Godwin's confidence that the individual might, without danger to either himself or society, dispense with the restraint of law or government was grounded in the conviction that man was fundamentally a rational being, and that in every situation in life he might rely upon his private judgment to supply the place of general principles in the determination of what was just. This philosophy, in a savage but penetrating piece of analysis, Lucas stigmatizes as a species of diabolism because of its affinity with the spirit of Satan. "So these Worthies, who carry every law, divine and human, within their own breasts, can never be guilty of any crime; for, whatever their conduct is, they can justify it to themselves; they never act without a reason, and that reason is law."[2] This creed dominates the actions of Godwinian villains so that, after a moment of introspection, they always see in the inclinations of egoism merely the dictates of an infallible understanding. Covetous of Amelia, who is beloved by his dearest friend, Frederick is able to find adequate Godwinian grounds for undertaking her seduction.[3] With his eye on Lord Monteith's estates, Fitzosborne argues to the conclusion that he himself, "an active, intelligent, enterprising citizen," should possess the property rather than "an indolent sensualist."[4] This creed, too, is the means by which schemers like Fitzosborne and Marauder corrupt their deluded victims, silencing by ingenious sophistry the instinctive protests of their moral nature and encouraging a defiant independence of all the prohibitions of traditional ethics. Striving to blunt Waldorf's conscience, Lok, like another Wordsworthian Oswald, argues cunningly: "Your judgment can never be wrong. Reason is never erroneous, but *false* sentiment may be your destruction. You are influenced by a set of chimerical notions of probity and honor; but this is the effect of romance; you will soon discriminate

[1] Robinson's *Diary*, I, 195.
[2] *The Infernal Quixote*, II, 268; III, 182.
[3] *The Vagabond*, Vol. I, chap. iii.
[4] *A Tale of the Times*, II, 294.

better and think differently."[1] Waldorf proves an apt pupil; determined to be "no automaton, agitated by springs to act by the directions of others," he rises superior to public opinion and accomplishes the ruin of three innocent women. Indeed, all of these rampant individualists are sensitive lest someone trespass upon the right of private judgment. Dorothea Melville, educated by a governess who is a disciple of the New Philosophy, at sixteen years of age repudiates her control as a form of despotism. Stupeo doubts "whether the very article of our birth be not a great breach of political justice, since our consent was not required."[2]

To no other principle of his philosophy do Godwin's opponents give more attention than to his doctrine of universal benevolence. What excited the repugnance of Godwin's contemporaries was the fact that his philosophy, while apparently directing human activity to a noble goal of unselfish achievement, in reality confused ethical values and tended to brutalize character and to encourage relentless egoism. As a rigid utilitarian Godwin laid it down as a fundamental principle that according to the requirements of absolute justice in every action of his life the individual should regulate his conduct with a view to producing the greatest good to the greatest number, and accordingly, if it is necessary in order to realize this ideal, he must proscribe all those immediate incentives to action—gratitude, friendship, domestic affection, and patriotism—which traditional moralists have insistently eulogized, but which, in fact, selfishly attach us to our associates and create a preference detrimental to the interest of humanity. From this slaughter of our most cherished feelings in the name of universal benevolence Godwin's contemporaries recoiled. They recognized that, not being omniscient, and consequently being unable to determine the ultimate effects of a proposed action, the conscientious man would contemplate helplessly innumerable possible modes of conduct; his duties as husband, father, and citizen would be obscured; in the interval his power of action would be paralyzed; and energies that might have been fruitful of much good would be wasted in futile, blundering calculations. They recognized that by means of this philosophy the wicked man would be able to justify

[1] *Waldorf*, I, 74.
The Vagabond, Vol. I, chap. ii.

the most egoistic impulses and under the guise of general utility prey upon society and commit the most heinous offenses. Evil is bad enough under any cricumstances, but it is infinitely worse when it masquerades as virtue. We are assured by one good clergyman that "the unholy speculations of Mr. Godwin were founded entirely upon this basis." Indeed, in defiance of truth and justice, the terrified moralists altogether too often bring the accusation that the new doctrines are adopted largely by those who wish to use them as a shield for crimes or vice.[1] Both the pamphleteers and the novelists show that the boasted reason is miserably unequal to the high tasks Godwin would impose upon it. They make it clear that reason is deficient in power to comprehend life in all its infinite variety and complexity and thereby to choose, on the basis of an unerring vision of the ultimate consequences of alternative courses of conduct, that course more conducive to the general good. They reveal the painful truth that in the absence of general principles the reason is incapable of a cool, detached analysis and judgment of facts, is swayed by the feelings, and for the most part becomes the base servitor of self-interest. They point to the danger that, in the flattering belief that the universe is the only suitable field for the activity of his benevolent impulses, the individual will scornfully neglect the numerous opportunities afforded by social intercourse for doing immediate and actual good within his capacity, and consequently life will be gradually stripped of the consolations conferred by gratitude, affection, and compassion.

In *Edmund Oliver* (1798), the novel after which Mme de Genlis, wishing to refute the Encyclopedists, modeled her *La Femme philosophe* (1800), Charles Lloyd, Coleridge's friend, arraigns the philosophy of reason and philanthropy. The heroine, Gertrude Sinclair, has dispensed with marriage and accepted D'Oyley as her lover. When Edmund appears and demands the fulfilment of her former promise to him, Gertrude, imagining herself completely emancipated from conventional scruples, attempts to argue away the obligation as a fetter of the mind, but in the conflict between her feelings and her "omnipotent reason" she suffers bitterly, and finally, when D'Oyley abandons her, her philosophy utterly fails her and she

[1] See Robert Hall, Findlater, Hannah More, and John Bowles.

is plunged into moral chaos. Obviously this is similar to the spiritual tragedy of the Wordsworthian Marmaduke, occasioned in this case, however, by different circumstances. In a satiric vein Walker has exhibited the inadequacy of reason. When a fire breaks out in Amelia's house, Frederick rushes to the rescue. Seizing a ladder, he deliberates whether he ought to save Amelia or her father, for, as a thorough Godwinian, he realizes that, should he save the one of less benefit to society, he would be committing a shameful injustice. While he is thus debating, the roof crashes in and kills both objects of his reflection. When the peasants, believing Frederick had good reason to wish to get rid of Amelia, threaten him with violence, Mr. Fenton urges his son to flee. Then Frederick deliberates whether his flight or his death would more promote the cause of truth, but when he hears the roaring mob outside he decides on the former course. "I really did not see that any good would result from my being hanged."[1] Later Frederick and Dr. Alegos visit a strange land inhabited by Godwinians, and meeting a man in deep thought inquire the object of his reflections. "I am debating," he replies, "whether it will be most to the public good, that I should help half an hour at getting in the harvest, or labour half an hour at building the new granary; I have spent all the morning in considering, and cannot determine."[2] In these fantastic instances the utilitarian idea results merely in futile mental exertion, absolute paralysis of the power of action, and the defeat of the benevolent impulse.

The doctrine of philanthropy is responsible for other equally startling situations. In obvious satire upon Emma Courteney's pursuit of Harley, under the spur of passion and a Godwinian sense of duty to herself and posterity, Bridgetina Botherim, infatuated with Dr. Sidney and inspired to serve the cause of general utility, abandons her old mother and follows him to London. When he puts her off, she waylays him wherever she can; when he flees from her as from a Nemesis, she bombards him with letters, fortified by the Godwinian conviction that as the reason is always accessible to argument it is necessary only to ply long enough a catapult of logic. In view

[1] *The Vagabond*, Vol. I, chap. iv. Godwin had maintained that under such circumstances Fenelon's valet should save the philosopher in preference to his own father. In *Edmund Oliver* (I, 128), Lloyd condemns this decision.

[2] Vol. II, chap. viii.

of her daughter's vagaries, one is not surprised that Bridgetina's illiterate old mother inquires with asperity: "And who is this General Utility whose name is forever in Biddy's mouth? She is always in a fret when I ask her, as if I should know all about him as well as she; but I am sure she may well know I never seed a General but General Villiers, in all my life." The anonymous writer of *Dorothea* represents her heroine as debating with herself whether she will marry a philosopher or an aristocrat, and as deciding in favor of the latter on the unsentimental ground that the good of society requires that she seize this opportunity to uproot the prejudices of a conservative.[1] Out of solicitude for humanity Frederick refuses to fight a duel and hazard the possibility of depriving the world of his services.[2] Vallaton betrays to the Revolutionary Tribunal an old man to whom he owes seven hundred pounds sterling, having convinced himself that this money belongs to him because he can accomplish the greater good with it.[3] Desirous of Arnon's property, Marauder tries to persuade him as "a citizen of the world" and "a lover of political justice" not to be influenced by such a weakness as love for a son.[4] After he has robbed his wife of her property and deserted her and his children, Williams cries: "Justice, immutable and unerring justice, lifts me above all selfish ties and considerations; I am neither father, husband, or brother to any individual! my children are posterity in the aggregate! I am wedded only to universal philanthropy, and my brother is man!"[5] Thus the novelists make clear their belief that, were Godwin's doctrine of the greatest good to the greatest number put in practice, it would encourage miserable self-deception and let loose upon society all the evils of a fatuous and, in many cases, criminal egoism.

Godwin never sinned against consistency. He eulogized liberty; it followed that he execrated marriage. It is absurd to expect continual agreement in inclination between two developing personalities. Whenever the man or the woman experiences discomfort from the restraints of an uncongenial union, let either him or her be free to

[1] I, 117.

[2] *The Vagabond*, Vol. I, chap. iii.

[3] *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers*, I, 73.

[4] *The Infernal Quixote*, III, 107.

[5] *Dorothea*, II, 148.

leave the other; Godwin did not shrink even from the suggestion that marriage be abolished. This was his protest; his critics construed it merely as a plea for licentiousness. The Godwinian villains specially seem to be convinced that wedlock is a species of despotism; the novelists represent them as preying upon innocence, and as a warning depict the miseries of innumerable Clarissa Harlowes. No novel is without its ruined virgin or betrayed wife. A few, indeed, like Mrs. West's *A Tale of the Times* and Mrs. Opie's *Adeline Mowbray*, give more attention to this aspect of Godwinism than to any other. The moral is always the obvious one: the woman who repudiates marriage is ostracized by society, and is, in the end, generally abandoned by her lover. Having been left to her own pursuits, Adeline Mowbray has read much revolutionary literature and is fired with a desire to carry her doctrines into practice. She meets a young philosopher, Glenmurry, who has written against marriage, and in time becomes his mistress. Society begins its punishment; because she knows the purity of her own motives Adeline suffers all the more when she is ignored by Glenmurry's friends, sneered at by servants, insulted by libertines, and driven from town as soon as her past is discovered. When, broken by her sorrows, she lies on her deathbed, she confesses the folly of her doctrines and admits her misery justly inflicted. Waldorf, the hero of Miss King's novel, having wrecked the lives of three women, is overwhelmed at the enormity of the evils he has brought upon others by his fallacious teachings, and in his remorse shoots himself. *The Citizen's Daughter, or What Might Be* shows by contrast the admirable self-respect and worth of a wife who, refusing to be the dupe of her feelings, is not deluded by the new liberal doctrines of sex-relationship and scornfully rejects the dishonorable proposals of a lover. This is a reproof to Mary Wollstonecraft, who had protested that the spiritual bondage of a woman unhappily married justified her in seeking a congenial mate.

The tendency of Godwin's assault upon marriage was to provide men and women of strong passions with a sophistical excuse for unrestrained indulgence. That is a danger the novelists never grow tired of emphasizing. The majority of their philosophers are rakes. In order to join a Utopian settlement among the Hottentots, Mr. Glib abandons his wife and five children on the ground that, convinced

that marriage is the worst of monopolies (Godwin's own words), he wishes to restore to his wife the liberty of which she has been deprived. She takes the hint and departs with a recruiting officer.[1] When Mrs. Cloudley elopes with Captain Ivory, she enlightens her husband as to the parentage of a brood of children he thought his own. Lucretia is the offspring of a coachman; Amazonia is legitimate and so, probably, is Brutus; but Voltaire is the son of a hairdresser, Hercules of a plowman, Tom Paine of a rat-catcher, and the child that died, of Marauder.[2] Mr. Cloudley's mind becomes unhinged, and liberal quotations from Godwin make clear where rests the responsibility for the condition of affairs.[3]

The novelists do not spare other doctrines of *Political Justice*. They portray the Godwinians as committing petty theft, forgery, and highway robbery, and justifying their actions as attempts to equalize the distribution of property. They are not chary with the abuse and ridicule which Godwin's conception of perfectibility invites. Mr. Vapour anticipates an age of reason in which men will not feel the need of either food or clothing,[4] and Williams foresees such a complete conquest of matter by mind that in the future to yield to death will be a contemptible weakness.[5] Walker gives an account of a land governed by Godwinian principles; it is as grotesque as Gulliver's kingdom of Lagado.[6] Formerly it possessed a noble civilization, but since the adoption of Godwinism, effected after a terrible civil war, it has fallen into decay. As the possibility of reward has been excluded lest it destroy the condition of equality, all incentive to effort has been annihilated, the people have become indolent and vicious for want of something to do, and genius, having no hope of encouragement, does not exert its power to contrive new inventions for the benefit of the race. Parecho, a citizen of the republic, regrets the old order and is in favor of aristocratic government. Completely disillusioned, Dr. Alogos determines to return to

[1] *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers*, III, 56.

[2] *The Infernal Quixote*, III, 201.

[3] Mrs. West's *The Infidel Father* (1802) and the anonymous *Memoirs of M. de Brinboc* (1805) also attack, in passing, Godwin's conception of marriage.

[4] *Letters of a Hindoo Rajah*, II, 148.

[5] *Dorothea*, I, 48.

[6] *The Vagabond*, Vol. II, chap. vii.

England to warn his fellow-countrymen against the evils they will bring upon themselves if they yield to the seductions of the New Philosophy.

The poetic justice that governs these novels is significant of the contemporary judgment of Godwinians. Bitter experience cures many of their philosophical vagaries. Mr. Myope, robbed of his mistress by a disciple, sees the light and lends a willing ear to Christianity. Mr. Glib repents and returns to his wife and children. Bridgetina is reconciled to the duties of a considerate daughter and Dorothea to those of a submissive wife. Ruined heroines all confess their error and either become insane, commit suicide, or go into a decline. Interrupted in the writing of a book entitled *The Supremacy of Reason* by the news that his cousin whom he had ruined had killed herself, Mr. Sceptic loses his mind and makes an effective use of a pistol. For a similar reason Waldorf violently puts an end to his life. His philosophical instructor Lok dies of grief and regret. The Godwinian villains who refuse to repent are dealt with unsparingly. Marauder, driven to bay, goes mad and hurls himself from a cliff; Fitzosborne kills himself in prison during the Terror; Williams is stabbed by one of his victims; Stupeo is burned alive by most un-Rousseauistic Indians; and Denham and Vallaton die upon the scaffold. *In pace requiescant!*

Such are the "novels of buffoonery and scandal" which Godwin refused to discuss in his reply to Dr. Parr's "Spital Sermon." It is clear that, whether satiric or serious, these novels represent the reaction of common sense against speculation typical of the age—a distorted conception of human nature, an absurd theory of perfectibility, and a visionary scheme of social reconstruction. But in justice to Godwin we should bear in mind that his hope of a millennial world without law or government and inhabited by childless rationalists was no farther removed from actuality than Rousseau's state of nature; both were the product of impotent idealism. This was an age of extremes, and rationalism and sentimentalism were equally guilty in committing sins of extravagant optimism. But, although we cannot approve of the savage intolerance of many of Godwin's opponents, and although we cannot admit that the novelists, in preaching the gospel of things as they are, always succeeded in disposing of the

issues raised by Godwin and Mary Wollstonecraft, since individualistic critics of marriage in our own age are still troubled by problems fundamentally the same, yet there can be no question that in general time has confirmed Godwin's contemporaries in the matter of their adverse judgment of the fundamental principles of *Political Justice.* It was inevitable that, after the first flush of enthusiasm for the revolutionary cause had passed away, many of Godwin's disciples should desert him, and that he himself should suffer the punishment of a defender of a hated and expiring cause. Yet in 1813, at the very time when Crabb Robinson records that Godwin was living in retirement, having almost been driven from society, the philosopher had a new, young disciple, a poet who was destined to embody the sophistries of *Political Justice* in forms of imperishable, intense beauty. That young disciple was none other than Percy Bysshe Shelley.

B. SPRAGUE ALLEN

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

SPENSER'S TWELVE MORAL VIRTUES "ACCORDING TO ARISTOTLE." II

After attempting to show that the virtues of Spenser's six[1] Books are not the ones discussed by Aristotle, Jusserand contends that Spenser's and Aristotle's virtues are unlike in that Aristotle treats all his virtues as means between extremes, even straining absurdly to do so, whereas Spenser treats only one of his, Temperance, as a mean, and it "only incidentally."[2] He admits that, "Either through direct or indirect borrowings, [Spenser] took from [Aristotle] his notion of the middle or virtuous state, standing between two faulty extremes." But he adds, "He did not try, as Aristotle did, to apply this theory to every virtue. It is only incidentally dwelt upon, forming the episode of Guyon's visit to Medina, Book II, c. 2."[3] This point is important; for Jusserand's criticism means that Spenser ignored, almost completely, Aristotle's fundamental conception of what a virtue is—ignored what is the most important and characteristic thing about Aristotle's moral philosophy. Let us see if he did.

Expressed in terms of method, Aristotle's moral philosophy is essentially this: (1) He develops a virtue by showing its opposites, and by discussing various phases of the virtue and of its opposites.[4] He treats a virtue as a mean between two extremes;[5] but he discusses various phases of the mean and of its extremes, and he tends to make any given virtue include all the others;[6] so that his virtues become a kind of center surrounded by many opposites.[7] (2) He gives great emphasis to what he calls "the opposite" of a virtue, and

[1] M. Jusserand holds that the fragment called Book VII is not a part of the *F. Q.* Therefore, he does not discuss it. I hope to discuss this fragment in a subsequent paper. "Book VII" is certainly Aristotelian.

[2] *Mod. Phil.*, III, 374, 381, and note.

[3] *Ibid.*, 381 and note.

[4] See *N. Eth.*, III, ix ff.; IV; and V. See also II, vii.

[5] See his definition of virtue "regarded in its essence or theoretical conception," *N. Eth.*, II, vi. See also II, viii.

[6] See his explanation of his definition of virtue, *N. Eth.*, VI, especially chaps. i and xiii.

[7] See *N. Eth.*, II, v; and II, ix.

says less, and in some cases almost nothing, about the other extreme, for his mean is not arithmetical; one who aims at the mean, he says, must, like Ulysses, keep farthest from Charybdis, the more dangerous of the two extremes.[1] And (3) he makes Reason the determiner of the right course in the case of each of the moral virtues.[2]

Such is the essence of Aristotle's moral philosophy. If, as Jusserand contends, Spenser ignores one of these principles, he is certainly not following Aristotle. If, as I shall undertake to prove, he applies all of these principles in his treatment of the virtues, he certainly does follow Aristotle, at least in essentials.

Spenser certainly develops the virtue of Holiness by showing its opposites, and by presenting various phases of the virtue and of its opposites. He represents Holiness by the Knight of Holiness (High-mindedness, moral perfection), Una (Christian Truth), Faith, Hope, and Charity, Heavenly Contemplation, and so on; and around these he groups Paganism, or Infidelity, "Blind Devotion"[3] (Corceca), Monastic Superstition (Abessa), "Hypocrise"[4] (Archimago), Falsehood (Duessa, "faire Falsehood"[5]), False Pride or Conceit (Orgoglio and Lucifera), the Seven Deadly Sins and all the other vices, Error (the Dragon of Error in the first canto), and Satan (in Lucifera's train, and the Dragon of Evil in canto xi).

Moreover, he represents the virtue as a mean between extremes and emphasizes one extreme. Paganism, represented by the Paynim brethren Sansfoy (Unbelief), Sansjoy (Joylessness), and Sansloy (Lawlessness), is certainly one extreme in regard to Holiness. The opposite extreme is represented by Corceca ("Blind Devotion"), Abessa (Monastic Superstition), and the Satyrs who worship even Una's ass. Corceca is an ignorant, blind old woman who says thirty-six hundred prayers every day. She dares not stop mumbling her prayers. Abessa is her daughter. Again, the Knight of Holiness is a mean between sinful 'joyaunce' and joyless faith and abstinence, though it costs him hard fighting to keep to this mean. After he has slain the Paynim Sansfoy (canto ii), he successfully resists (canto iv) the temptation to join with Duessa in the "joyaunce" of the gay party composed of the Seven Deadly Sins. But immediately after he has resisted the joyance of sin, he is attacked

[1] See *N. Eth.*, II, ix. [2] *Ibid.*, II, vi. [3] I, iii, Arg. [4] I, i, Arg. [5] I, ii, Arg.

by the Paynim Sansjoy, who proposes to cancel his victory over Sansfoy by taking away the shield which is the emblem of his victory.[1] He is least fortified on the side of Joylessness; we are told upon our first introduction to him that "of his cheere [he] did seeme too solemne sad."[2] Accordingly, the battle which ensues with Sansjoy is one of the hardest of his career.[3] Once more, the Knight of Holiness is, as we have already seen, Aristotle's mean of Highmindedness. He thinks himself worthy of great things and is worthy of them; he neither overestimates nor underestimates his own worth—he is neither conceited nor meanminded. Arthur also represents this mean of Highmindedness. He thinks himself worthy of great honor, and is worthy of it. He aspires to the hand of great Gloriana (Glory), but we know, not only from his moral perfection, but also from the direct testimony of Una and the Knight of Holiness, that he is worthy of her.[4] According to Aristotle, the worst case of Meanmindedness, one of the two extremes in regard to Highmindedness, is the man of great worth who underestimates his own deserts—cares too little for honor. Sir Satyrane, in a measure, illustrates this extreme. We feel that he is capable of as great things as Guyon or Calidore. Yet he disappoints us; he does nothing supremely great. Although he is possessed of great worth and wins fame—"through all Faery lond his famous worth was blown"[5]—he cares nothing for great honor. He is not among those who seek quests from great Gloriana,

That glorie does to them for guerdon graunt.[6]

To represent Conceit, the other main extreme in regard to Highmindedness, two characters are drawn, one masculine and one feminine. Orgoglio (Ital. *orgoglio*, pride; cf. GK. ὀργάω), though born of dirt and wind, and fostered by Ignaro (Ignorance), thinks himself very great. But when he is slain by the Knight of Holiness, his huge trunk collapses like a punctured bladder, showing that he is puffed up with conceit. Lucifera (the sinful mistress of the "house

[1] For the joyfulness of Faith, see Spenser's description of Faith (Fidelia) in canto x, especially stanzas 12–14.

[2] I, i, 2.

[3] For the importance which Spenser attaches to this battle against joylessness, see the author's comments in canto v, stanza 1.

[4] I, ix, 16, 17. [5] I, vi, 29. [6] I, x, 59.

of Pryde"[1]) is excessively proud and supercilious, though she is only the daughter of "Griesly Pluto" and the "Queene of Hell" and is thoroughly unworthy of honor. She includes all the Seven Deadly Sins, as Highmindedness includes all the virtues. Duessa also serves to represent Conceit,[2] though her main business is to represent Falsehood; she is very proud of her beauty and finery, but when stripped of false show, she proves to be only a filthy old hag. Clearly Spenser's emphasis is on the extreme of Conceit or False Pride.

Finally, Spenser certainly makes Reason the determiner of the mean for the virtue of Holiness. In canto ii the arch-deceiver Archimago makes the Knight of Holiness believe that his lady, Una, has stained her honor. Enraged, the Knight deserts Una, for whom he has undertaken to slay the Dragon of Evil, and rides off alone. He has ceased to be governed by Reason. We are told:

> The eye of [his] reason was with rage yblent.[3]

Later we see again that he is guided not by Reason, but by 'will':

> Will was his guide, and griefe led him astray.[4]

This is the beginning of all his troubles. He now misses the mean of Highmindedness. After a narrow escape from the House of Pride with its vices and pitiable victims, he is captured by Orgoglio (False Pride, Conceit) and languishes in his prison until rescued by Arthur (Highmindedness). Again, in canto vii, Arthur meets the deserted Una. In persuading her to unfold her grief, he advises her that "flesh may empaire . . . . but reason can repaire."[5] And "his goodly reason"[6] wins. Thus we see that both Una and the Knight of Holiness must be governed by Reason. But so must Arthur. In canto ix, in which Arthur tells of the vision which caused him to fall in love with Gloriana, and of his pursuit of Glory, Arthur says:

> But me had warnd old Timons wise behest,
> Those creeping flames by reason to subdew, etc.[7]

Here again Reason is the determiner of the mean in regard to Highmindedness, or love of honor. Finally, even the Paynim Sansfoy apologizes for forgetting "the raines to hold of reasons rule."[8]

[1] I, iv, Arg.
[2] Note in I, iv, 37, that Duessa rides next to Lucifera.
[3] Stanza 5. [4] Stanza 12. [5] Stanza 41. [6] Stanza 42. [7] Stanza 9. [8] I, iv, 41

We come now to Temperance. Everyone knows that Spenser develops this virtue and the virtues of all his other Books by showing their opposites and by presenting various phases of the virtue and of its opposites, and that he tends to make any given virtue all-inclusive. From the book of any one of Spenser's virtues a good case could be made out for all the moral virtues. But Spenser not only presents various phases of Temperance; he treats the same phases of Temperance that Aristotle treats. For example, outside of Temperance and Incontinence in the strict sense, the kinds of intemperance most emphasized by Aristotle are incontinence in regard to angry passion, incontinence in regard to honor, and incontinence in regard to wealth or gain. Aristotle specially and repeatedly mentions these as things in regard to which men may be incontinent in the broad sense. For instance, he says: "Men are called incontinent in respect of angry passion, honor, and gain."[1] Now these are the very kinds of intemperance which, outside of intemperance in the strict sense, Spenser presents most strongly. Angry passion Spenser exemplifies in Furor; in Phedon, who, "chawing vengeance,"[2] murders his sweetheart and his bosom friend, and is trying to murder his sweetheart's maid when he falls into the hands of Furor; and in Pyrochles, who "Furors chayne unbinds."[3] Incontinence in respect of honor Spenser exemplifies in "Vaine Braggadocchio."[4] He is one of Aristotle's "Conceited people," who, says Aristotle, "are foolish and ignorant of themselves and make themselves conspicuous by being so. . . . . They get themselves up in fine dresses, and pose for effect, and so on, and wish their good fortune to be known to all the world, and talk about themselves as if that were the road to honor."[5] Braggadocchio represents Conceit, or desire of honor by one who is unworthy of it, one of the opposites of Highmindedness, or right love of honor on a great scale. Again, one of the greatest of the temptations in Spenser's Cave of Mammon is Ambition, one of Aristotle's extremes in regard to ordinary honors. Incontinence in regard to wealth or gain is, of course, powerfully presented in Mammon, who tempts the Knight of Temperance in canto vii.

But, in addition to treating it as a kind of center surrounded by opposites, Spenser treats Temperance as a mean between extremes,

[1] *N. Eth.*, VII, ii. [2] II, iv, 29. [3] II, v, Arg. [4] II, iii, Arg. [5] *N. Eth.*, IV, ix.

emphasizes one extreme in particular, and makes Reason the determiner of the mean. In the first canto of his Book on Temperance, he works out Aristotle's mean concerning Temperance. Although Aristotle holds that all the virtues are concerned with pleasure and pain, he gives peculiar emphasis to the relation of Temperance to pleasure and pain in his definition of the virtue. He says: "In respect of pleasures and pains, although not indeed of all pleasures and pains, and to a less extent in respect of pains than of pleasures, the mean state is Temperance."[1] Again, in connection with Incontinence, Aristotle gives an important place to the vice of Effeminacy. He says:

> Of the characters which have been described the one [incontinence] is rather a kind of effeminacy; the other is licentiousness. The opposite of the incontinent character is the continent, and of the effeminate the steadfast; for steadfastness consists in holding out against pain, and continence in overcoming pleasure, and it is one thing to hold out, and another to overcome, as it is one thing to escape being beaten and another to win a victory. . . . . If a person gives way where people generally resist and are capable of resisting, he deserves to be called effeminate. . . . . It is only unpardonable where a person is mastered by things against which most people succeed in holding out, and is impotent to struggle against them, unless his impotence be due to hereditary constitution or to disease, as effeminacy is hereditary in the kings of Scythia, or as woman is naturally weaker than a man.

And he continues: "It is people of a quick and atrabilious temper whose incontinence is particularly apt to take the form of impetuosity; for the rapidity or the violence of their feeling prevents them from waiting for the guidance of reason."[2] Finally, Aristotle condemns suicide as Effeminacy: "For it is effeminacy to fly from troubles, nor does the suicide face death because it is noble, but because it is a refuge from evil."[3] In canto one of Spenser's Book on Temperance we have the story of Mordant and Amavia. Acrasia (Intemperance), a beautiful but wicked enchantress, entices Sir Mordant away from his wife and finally poisons him; and the wife, in a fit of grief, commits suicide. Sir Guyon (the Knight of Temperance) and his Palmer (Reason or Prudence), having learned the story from the expiring wife, stand looking at the two dead bodies. Sir Guyon, turning to his Palmer, says:

> Old Syre
> Behold the image of mortalitie,

[1] *N. Eth.*, II, vii. [2] *Ibid.*, VII, viii. [3] *Ibid.*, III, xi.

And feeble nature cloth'd with fleshly tyre,
When raging passion with fierce tyrannie,
Robs *reason* of her due regalitie,
And makes it servant to her basest part:
The *strong* it weakens with infirmitie,
And with bold furie armes the *weakest* hart;
The strong through *pleasure* soonest falles, the
weake through *smart.*

Then Sir Guyon's Palmer (Reason) replies:

But *temperance* (said he) with golden squire
Betwixt them both can measure out a *meane,*
Neither to melt in *pleasures* whot desire,
Nor fry in hartlesse *griefe* and dolefull *teene.*
Thrise happie man, who *fares them both atweene.*[1]

Thus the incontinent Sir Mordant and the effeminate Amavia meet disaster because they fail to take the mean which Reason dictates in regard to "pleasure" and "smart." It will be noted that Spenser follows Aristotle even in such details as showing that greater strength is required to overcome pleasure than to resist pain. The importance which Spenser attaches to the suicide described in the episode is indicated by the name Amavia (Love of Life). Love of Life effeminately gives way to pain. The lesson of this canto cannot possibly be called "only incidental"; for Sir Guyon's relation to Mordant and Amavia is one of the larger elements of the plot, and one of the few discussed in Spenser's letter to Raleigh. It is the fate of Mordant and Amavia at the hands of Acrasia (Intemperance) which causes Guyon, the Knight of Temperance, to enter upon his quest to bind Acrasia.

So much for canto i. In canto ii Spenser works out the mean in regard to Aristotelian Temperance in the strict, or particular, sense.[2] Here, to quote Spenser's argument to the canto, Sir Guyon is shown

the face of golden Meane.
Her sisters two Extremities
strive her to banish cleane.

Reason is made the determiner of the mean.[3]

What we have said of Spenser's treatment of Temperance as a mean between extremes is hardly more than a beginning of what

[1] II, i, 57–58.

[2] With the episode of Guyon's visit to Medina cf. *N. Eth.*, II, vii; III, xiii; and VII, xi.

[3] See especially II, ii, 38. See also stanzas 15 and 17.

could be said if space permitted. See, for example, canto xii, which is a series of studies of the mean. The truth is that the whole Book is a study of the mean. Like Aristotle, Spenser puts the emphasis on the extreme of excess, not on that of deficiency. Again, we have mentioned only a few of the numerous instances in which Spenser makes Reason the determiner of the mean. See, for example, the author's comments in stanzas 1–2 of canto xi, in which Spenser lays down the general principle that Reason is the determiner of the mean in regard to Temperance. Another point is worth noting. Although Aristotle makes Reason the determiner of the mean in the case of each of the moral virtues, he gives peculiar emphasis to the rule of Reason in regard to Temperance. Accordingly, Spenser gives the greatest possible emphasis to the rule of reason in respect of Temperance. For example, Aristotle says in his discussion of Temperance: "As a child ought to live according to the direction of his tutor (παιδαγωγός) so ought the concupiscent element in man to live according to the reason."[1] And Spenser gives his Knight of Temperance a tutor, the black Palmer, who continually accompanies, instructs, and directs him, and whom his "pupill"[2] (Guyon) faithfully obeys. It is hardly necessary to add that Guyon's Palmer is Reason. If other proof than the allegory be needed that he is so, it may be found, for example, in II, i, 34; or in II, iv, 2; or in II, xii, 38.

Passing to Chastity, Book III, we find that Spenser again follows Aristotle's method of treating a virtue and his conception of what a virtue is. Even Chastity is presented as a mean between extremes. Moreover, the extremes themselves are Aristotelian.

There is a very close relation between Shame, or Chastity, and Temperance. Both Aristotle and Spenser make Temperance include sex morality. The extremes of Aristotelian Shame, or Modesty, in the strict sense, are Shamelessness and Licentiousness, on the one hand, and Bashfulness, lack of courteous bearing, on the other.[3] The extremes of Aristotelian Temperance, in the strict sense, are Licentiousness and Incontinence, on the one hand, and Insensibility, or Asceticism, on the other.[4] Now it will be remembered that

[1] *N. Eth.*, III, xv.
[2] II, viii, 7.
[3] *N. Eth.*, II, vii, and IV, xv; *Rhetoric*, II, vi, and II, xii–xiii.
[4] *N. Eth.*, II, vii; III, xiii–xv; VII, especially chap. xi.

Spenser in his discussion of Chastity draws not only upon Aristotle's discussion of Shame, or Modesty, but also upon that part of his discussion of Temperance which has to do with sex morality. Accordingly he makes the extremes of his virtue of Chastity the Aristotelian extremes of Shamelessness, Licentiousness, and Incontinence, on the one hand, and Discourtesy and Insensibility, or Asceticism, or Celibacy, on the other.

In the proem to the Book on Chastity, Spenser tells us that just as Gloriana represents the rule of Elizabeth, so Belphoebe represents "her rare chastity," and he makes the same point in his letter to Raleigh. In telling how Belphoebe cared for her "flower" of "chastity and virtue virginal," he indicates the extremes:

> That dainty Rose, the daughter of the Morne,
> More deare then life she tendered, whose flowre
> The girlond of her honour did adorne:
> Ne suffred she the *Middayes scorching powre,*
> Ne the *sharp Northerne wind* thereon to showre,
> But lapped up her silken leaves most chaire,
> When so the froward skye began to lowre:
> But soone as calmed was the Christall aire,
> She did it faire dispred, and let to florish faire.[1]

For the Courtesy of Belphoebe see, in III, v, 27–55,[2] the story of her nursing the wounded Timias and of her treatment of him, a social inferior, when he falls in love with her. Belphoebe is praised because she can be chaste without running into the extreme of Discourtesy:

> In so great prayse of stedfast *chastity,*
> *Nathlesse* she was so *curteous and kind,*
> Tempred with *grace* and goodly *modesty,*
> That seemed those *two vertues* strove to find
> The higher place in her Heroick mind.

To realize the seriousness of this extreme of Discourtesy it is only necessary to note the contemptible character of the discourteous Mirabella in Spenser's Book on Courtesy. Discourtesy here clearly includes the idea of celibacy. It should be remembered that Spenser's Courtesy is Aristotle's Friendliness—readiness to act as a true friend

[1] III, v, 51. See also stanzas 50–55, especially 52.

[2] Note especially III, v, 54–55. See also III, vi, 1–3.

would act—and that, with both Aristotle and Spenser, Friendship includes love. In his argument to canto vii of Book VI Spenser tells us that we are to learn of "Fayre Mirabellaes punishment for loves disdaine decreed." Mirabella is cruel to her lovers and even boasts of the fact that they suffer and die because of their love for her. "She did all love despize." She is determined to live a life of celibacy.

> She was borne free, not bound to any wight,
> And so would ever live, and love her owne delight.[1]

Such is the Discourtesy, or Unfriendliness, which is one of the extremes in regard to Chasity. Mirabella is finally brought to justice by Cupid.

Another passage in which Spenser represents Discourtesy and Celibacy as an extreme in regard to Chastity is in canto vi of the Book on Chastity. Venus has lost her little son, Cupid. In searching a wood for him, she comes upon her sister, Diana, of whom she makes inquiries. Diana is ungracious, intolerant:

> Thereat Diana gan to smile, in scorne
> Of her vaine plaint, and to her scoffing sayd;
> "Great pittie sure, that ye be so forlorne
> Of your gay sonne, that gives you so good ayd
> To your disports: ill mote ye bene apayd."
> But she was more engrieved, and replide;
> "Faire sister, ill beseemes it to upbrayd
> A dolefull heart with so disdainfull pride;
> The like that mine, may be your paine another tide.
> . . . . . .
> And ill becomes you with your loftie creasts,
> To scorne the joy, that Jove is glad to seek;
> We both are bound to follow heavens beheasts,
> And tend our charges with obeisance meeke.
> Spare, gentle sister, with reproch my paine to eeke."[2]

After Diana has made further insulting speeches, she is finally induced to join in the search for Cupid. While searching, Diana and Venus find Belphoebe and Amoretta, two babes born at a birth, Belphoebe being born first, and then Amoretta, to show that first comes maidenly chastity, "perfect Maydenhed," and then love and

[1] VI, vii, 30–31. [2] III, vi, 21–22.

"goodly womanhed." Diana and Venus decide each to adopt one of the babes.

> Dame Phoebe [Diana] to a Nymph her babe betooke,
> To be upbrought in perfect Maydenhed,
> And to her selfe her name Belphoebe red:
> But Venus hers thence farre away convayed,
> To be upbrought in goodly womanhed.[1]

Venus takes Amoretta to be brought up in the Garden of Adonis, where, we are told,

> All things, as they created were, doe grow,
> And yet remember well *the mightie word,*
> *Which first was spoken by th' Almightie lord,*
> *That bad them to increase and multiply.*[2]

Perhaps Spenser's plainest condemnation of Celibacy and Insensibility, or Asceticism, is the episode dealing with Marinell in the Book on Chastity. Marinell is "a mighty man at arms." He eschews the love of women, for Proteus, the sea-god and prophet, has taught his mother to keep him from all womankind:

> For thy she gave him warning every day,
> The love of women not to entertaine;
> A lesson too too hard for living clay,
> From love in course of Nature to refraine:
> Yet he his mothers lore did well retaine,
> And ever from faire Ladies love did fly;
> Yet many Ladies fair did oft complaine,
> That they for love of him would algates dy:
> Dy, who so list for him, he was loves enimy.[3]

One of the first great victories of Britomart (Chastity) is her defeat of this sturdy champion.

Though Britomart leaves Marinell for dead, his mother, Cymoent, by her magic finally revives him. We now learn that fair Florimell loves Marinell, but is scorned by him. In canto xi of Book IV Spenser gives a synopsis of the story of Marinell and Florimell, in order to continue it. The lovely Florimell, because she will not grant her love to the sea-god Proteus, is suffering horrible torments at Proteus' hands.

> And all this was for love of Marinell,
> Who her despysed (ah who would her despyse?)
> And *wemens love did from his hart expell,*
> *And all those joyes that weak mankind entyse.*[4]

[1] III, vi, 28. [2] III, vi, 34. [3] III, iv, 25–26. [4] IV, xi, 5.

Clearly this is Celibacy and Insensibility, or Asceticism. Marinell is finally reformed by the love of Florimell.

One more episode might be given here. It is in the opening canto of the Book on Chastity. Britomart, who fights for Chastity, and the Red Cross Knight (Holiness), who "gave her good aid," come in their journey to "Castle Joyous," presided over by the witch Malecasta, called "the Lady of Delight." In the "sumptuous guize" of Castle Joyous the knights see

> The image of superfluous riotize,
> Exceeding much the state of meane degree.[1]

Smith and Selincourt define the term "meane," in this passage, as "middling"; and indeed the context seems to make any other interpretation impossible.

Proof that the contemptible Mirabella of the Book on Courtesy is Discourtesy (if that can need special proof), and that Marinell of the Book on Chastity also illustrates Discourtesy—both being guilty of the serious offense of Cruelty, Unfriendliness, toward their lovers—may be had by comparing their conduct with the Courtesy of Britomart (Chastity) toward even the amorous "Lady of Delight," who, deceived by Britomart's armor, woos the Knight of Chastity in no modest manner. Britomart considers the feelings of other people and therefore does not rebuff the Lady of Delight until her conduct becomes outrageous:

> For thy she would not in discourteise wise,
> Scorne the faire offer of good will profest;
> For great rebuke it is, love to despise,
> Or rudely sdiegne a gentle harts request.[2]

Finally, a consideration of the characters in Book III shows plainly that Spenser treats Chastity as a mean, and that his extremes are the Aristotelian ones already mentioned. Marinell and Diana go to extremes in the direction of Discourtesy and Celibacy. Britomart, Belphoebe, Amoretta, and the true Florimell represent the mean. The extreme of Licentiousness is emphatically represented in the horrible Titan twins, Argante and Ollyphant, the hyena-like Brute, Proteus, Malecasta, the false Florimell, the infamous Hellenore, and Busyrane.

[1] III, i, 33. [2] III, i, 55.

In addition to treating Chastity as a mean, Spenser not only discusses various phases of the virtue, after the manner of Aristotle, but draws from Aristotle the virtues and vices which he discusses in connection with Chastity. This fact throws light on an otherwise difficult passage in the *Faerie Queene*. In his continued discussion of Temperance,[1] already referred to, Aristotle has a curious discussion of brutality, or unnatural vice. "There is more excuse," he says, "for following natural impulses, as indeed there is for following all such desires as are common to all the world, and the more common they are, the more excusable they are also."[2] Again he says, "And if these are brutal states, there are others which are produced in some people by disease and madness. . . . . Other such states again are the result of a morbid disposition or of habit." In this brutal or unnatural conduct he includes "unnatural vice," which he elsewhere refers to as "unnatural passion."[3] Compare this with Book III, canto ii, of the *Faerie Queene*. Britomart, who represents Elizabeth as well as Chastity, is madly in love with Artegall (Justice). In the midst of this fine compliment to the Queen we have the following curious passage put in the mouth of Glauce, Britomart's old nurse, after Britomart has confessed her love:

> Daughter (said she) what need ye be dismayd,
> Or why make ye such Monster of your mind?
> *Of much more uncouth thing I was affrayd;*
> *Of filthy lust, contrarie unto kind:*
> But this affection nothing straunge I find;
> For who with *reason* can you aye reprove,
> To love the semblant pleasing most your mind,
> And yield your heart, whence ye cannot remove?
> No guilt in you, but in the tyranny of love.
>
> Not so th' Arabian Myrrhe did set her mind;
> Nor so did Biblis spend her pining hart,
> But lov'd their native flesh against all kind,
> And to their purpose used wicked art:
> Yet played Pasiphaë a more monstrous part,
> That lov'd a bull, and learned a beast to bee;
> Such *shamefull* lusts who loaths not, which depart
> From course of *nature* and of *modestie?*
> Sweet love such lewdness bands from his faire companie.[4]

[1] *N. Eth.*, VII, i and vi–vii. [2] *Ibid.*, VII, vii. [3] *Ibid.*, VII, vi. [4] III, ii, 40–41.

I cannot resist giving another example of Spenser's conformity to Aristotle's scheme. In cantos ix and x of Spenser's Book on Chastity we have the story of Hellenore and Malbecco. The latter, at first a real character, in canto x becomes Jealousy in one of the most powerful of all Spenser's personifications. It is the unlikeness of Malbecco and Hellenore which causes their great unhappiness. This unlikeness includes the fact that Malbecco has reached the age of impotence, while his wife is young. Their unhappiness results in the "rape" of Hellenore (Helen) by Paridell (Paris). That their unhappiness is brought about by their inequality and unlikeness is clear from reading the cantos. I quote a few passages, however, which establish this point by literal exposition:

> But all his mind is set on mucky pelfe,
> Yet is he lincked to a lovely lasse,
> . . . . . .
> The which to him both far unequall yeares,
> And also far unlike conditions has;
> For she does joy to play emongst her peares,
> And to be free from hard restraint and gealous feares.
>
> But he is old, and withered like hay,
> Unfit faire Ladies service to supply.
> The privie guilt whereof makes him alway
> Suspect her truth, and keepe continuall spy
> Upon her with his other blincked eye;
> Ne suffreth he resort of living wight
> Approch to her, ne keepe her company,
> But in close bowre her mewes from all mens sight,
> Depriv'd of kindly joy and naturall delight.
>
> Malbecco he, and Hellenore she hight,
> Unfitly yokt together in one teeme.
> . . . . . .
> Fast good will with gentle courtesyes,
> And timely service to her pleasures meet
> May her perhaps containe, that else would algates fleet.[1]

Now there is a very close relation between the virtues of Chastity and Friendship, for Aristotle makes Friendship include love and the relation of husband and wife.[2] Again, Aristotle repeatedly makes

[1] III, ix, 4–7.

[2] That Aristotelian Friendship includes love is clear from the whole of Book VIII of *N. Eth.* The Friendship of husband and wife is discussed specifically in chap. xii.

the point that perfect Friendship requires perfect equality and likeness, and that any Friendship requires approximate equality and likeness. For example, he says: "In Friendship quantitative equality is first and proportionate second. This is clearly seen to be the case if there be a wide distinction between two persons in respect of virtue, vice, affluence, or anything else. For persons so widely different cease to be friends; they do not even affect to be friends."[1] Thus the lesson that the inequality and unlikeness of Malbecco and Hellenore is the cause of their destruction is straight Aristotelian doctrine. But this is not all. In the *Politics*, which is a continuation of the *Nicomachean Ethics*,[2] Aristotle discusses the subject of marriage. At the beginning of chapter xvi of Book VI he says:

> In legislating about this association [marriage] he [the legislator] should have in view, not only the persons themselves who are to marry, but their time of life, so that they may arrive simultaneously at corresponding periods in respect of age, and there may not be a discrepancy between their powers, whether it is that the husband is still able to beget children and the wife is not, or *vice versa*, as this is a state of things which is a source of mutual bickerings and dissentions.

And Aristotle reiterates the idea throughout the chapter. That this point is the part of the lesson to which Spenser gives emphasis is clear, not only from the story and the literal exposition, but also from the name Malbecco.[3] But even the idea of the impotent old husband's love of money and disregard of honor is Aristotelian. In the *Nicomachean Ethics*, IV, iii, Aristotle says: "Illiberality is incurable; for it seems that old age or impotence of any kind makes men illiberal," and he repeats this thought in the *Rhetoric*.[4]

Again, Spenser makes it indisputably clear that reason is the determiner of the right course in respect of Chastity. Thus, as we have already seen, the old nurse Glauce, who in a measure represents Reason, or Prudence, assures Britomart (Chastity) that her conduct

[1] *N. Eth.*, VIII, ix.

[2] Not only the last chapter of the *N. Eth.* but the whole book prepares the way for the *Politics*. It is upon the relation between Morality and Reason, or Prudence, explained in the *N. Eth.*, that the legislator of the *Politics* bases his laws.

[3] Ital. *becco*, a buck, a goat, a cuckold; cf. Marston, *Malcontent*, I, i, 118–20:

M. Duke, thou art a *becco*, a cornuto.
P. How?
M. Thou art a cuckold.

[4] II, xiii.

is right, for it is in accordance with Reason.[1] On the other hand, we are told concerning the unholy passion of the witch's son:

So strong is passion that no *reason* hears.[2]

In discussing the virtue of Friendship, Spenser does not make much of the mean. But neither does his master. Aristotle only suggests that perhaps we ought to observe the mean in regard to the number of friendships which we undertake to maintain. Like Aristotle, however, Spenser does develop the virtue of Friendship by showing its opposites and by presenting various phases of the virtue and of its opposites. Thus he discusses Discord as well as Concord, Hate as well as Love,[3] Falseness (Duessa) as well as "Friendship trew." He shows not only the friendship of the virtuous, as seen in such cases as that of Cambel and Triamond, but also the friendship of the vicious, friendship for gain, and so on, in such cases as the friendship of Blandamour and Paridell, which, in accordance with Aristotle's teaching, soon ends in strife.[4] Professor Erskine[5] asserts that Spenser's Book on Friendship "seems at first sight to treat only of jealousies and quarrels." He brings forward *two sentences* of Cicero from which he thinks Spenser must have learned that it was possible to present Friendship by showing its opposite. The fact is that in presenting Friendship by showing its opposite Spenser is not only doing what Aristotle did in every one of his virtues, but is doing what he himself did in every book of the *Faerie Queene*.

Moreover, Spenser discusses the same opposites and phases of Friendship that Aristotle discusses. For example, Aristotle deals with the friendship of the virtuous, which endures, and the friendship of the vicious, friendship for gain, and so on, which does not endure. We have already seen that Spenser represents these phases of Friendship. Again, Aristotle's Friendship is of three main kinds: the friendship of kinsmen, the friendship of love, including marriage, and friendship in the ordinary sense.[6] In IV, ix, 1–3 of the *Faerie Queene*, Spenser gives a plain, literal exposition of these three kinds

[1] III, ii, 40.
[2] III, vii, 21.
[3] IV, x, 34 and 32.
[4] IV, ii, 13, 18.
[5] *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XXIII, 846.
[6] See, for example, *N. Eth.*, VIII, xii.

of Friendship, as Professor Erskine has observed;[1] and he reiterates this classification throughout the book.[2] Again, in connection with love Spenser illustrates the Aristotelian extremes of insensibility, or celibacy, unreasonable love, inconstancy, and licentiousness.[3] Once more, in the Book on Friendship, as well as in the Book on Chastity, Spenser follows Aristotle in making equality and likeness essential to Friendship. Friendship is impossible between Cambell and any one of the three brothers, Priamond, Diamond, and Triamond.[4] But when Triamond, by receiving the spirits of his two brothers, becomes the equal of Cambell, the two become perfect friends.[5] Spenser does not stop, however, at showing friendship between these equals of high degree; he shows also friendship between two equal and like persons of low degree, the two squires in cantos viii and ix.[6] Finally, the most striking thing about Aristotle's discussion of Friendship is his identification of this virtue with Concord in the State. He says: "Again, it seems that friendship or love is the bond which holds states together, and that legislators set more store by it than by justice; for concord is apparently akin to friendship, and it is concord that they especially seek to promote, and faction, as being hostility to the state, that they especially try to expel."[7] Even this phase of Aristotelian Friendship is emphatically presented in the *Faerie Queene*. In the first canto of his Book on Friendship, Spenser presents Discord, the enemy of Friendship, whom the wicked witch Duessa has brought to hell "to trouble noble knights."

> Her name was Ate, mother of *debate*,
> And all *dissention* which doth dayly grow
> Amongst fraile men, that many a *publike state*
> And many a *private* oft doth overthrow.
> . . . . . .
> Hard by the gates of hell her dwelling is,
> . . . . . .
> Yet many waies to enter may be found,

[1] *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XXIII, 849.
[2] Note, for example, the "friends," "brethren," and "lovers" of IV, i, 24.
[3] See IV, ix, 21.
[4] IV, ii–iii.
[5] IV, iii, 26–37, especially 37.
[6] See especially viii, 55–56, and ix, 10–11.
[7] *N. Eth.*, VIII, i.

But none to issue forth when one is in:
For *discord* harder is to end then to begin.

And all within the riven walls were hung
With ragged monuments of times forepast,
All which the sad effects of *discord* sung.

Among these "monuments" are "broken scepters," "great cities ransackt," and "nations captived and huge armies slaine." "There was the signe of antique Babylon," of Thebes, of Rome, of Salem, and "sad Ilion." There were the names of Nimrod and "of Alexander, and his Princes five Which shar'd to them the spoiles that he had got alive." And there too were the "relicks . . . . of the dreadfull *discord*, which did drive The noble Argonauts to outrage fell."

For all this worlds faire workmanship she tride,
Unto his last confusion to bring,
And that great golden chaine quite to divide,
With which it blessed *Concord* hath together tide.

Thus Spenser follows Aristotle in making Friendship include Concord in the State. The same idea comes out in Spenser's presentation of Concord in canto x:

Concord she cleeped was in common reed,
Mother of blessed *Peace*, and Friendship trew.[1]

In discussing his fifth virtue, Justice, Spenser expresses the mean in almost the exact words of Aristotle. Aristotle tells us that particular Justice has to do with the goods of fortune.[2] He defines Justice as follows: "Just conduct is a mean between committing and suffering injustice; for to commit injustice is to have too much, and to suffer it is to have too little."[3] In the proem to Book V Spenser in describing the Golden Age, when all men were just, says:

And all men sought their owne, and none no more.

Again, in Book V proper, Spenser's treatment of Justice as a mean is unmistakable. In canto ii we have the Gyant with his "huge great paire of ballance." Complaining that this world's goods are unjustly, because unequally, distributed, the Gyant proposes to weigh everything and make a just distribution. He has asserted

[1] IV, x, 34. [2] *N. Eth.*, V, ii. [3] *N. Eth.*, V, ix.

that he "could *justly* weigh the *wrong and right,*" and Artegall (Justice) is testing him. Artegall finally tells him:

> But set the truth and set the right aside,
> For they with wrong or falshood will not fare;
> And put *two wrongs* together to be tride,
> Or else *two falses*, each of equall share;
> And then together doe them both compare.
> For truth is one, and right is ever one.
> So did he, and then plaine it did appeare,
> Whether of them the greater were attone.
> *But right sate in the middest of the beame alone.*
>
> But he the right from thence did thrust away,
> For it was not the right, which he did seeke;
> But rather strove extremities to way,
> Th' one to diminish th' other for to eeke.
> For of the meane he greatly did misleeke.[1]

At this point Talus, Artegall's iron squire (the iron hand of Justice), hurls the Gyant into the sea and drowns him. This mean which the Gyant "misleekes," and which Justice demands, is not simply a mean but Aristotle's mean of Justice; for it is the mean in regard to the distribution of the goods of fortune. Moreover, the episode is Aristotelian in every particular. Aristotle teaches that equality as applied to Justice must be proportionate, not absolute. Justice, he holds, demands that the goods of fortune be distributed proportionately to the varying degrees of virtue in the citizens.[2] He even protests particularly against an equalization of property and reiterates this protest.[3]

Spenser's characters in this Book represent not only the mean but also the two Aristotelian extremes in regard to Justice: that of accepting less than rightfully belongs to one, and that of taking more. The first is represented by the Squire who is wronged by Sir Sanglier. Sanglier will not "rest contented with his right,"[4] but, "the fairere love to gaine," takes the Squire's Ladie and slays

[1] V, ii, 45–49.

[2] *N. Eth.*, Book V. Aristotle makes the same point in his discussion of Friendship. See *N. Eth.*, VIII, ix.

[3] See, for example, *Politics*, VIII, ix.

[4] V, i, 17.

his own. The Squire complains to Artegall. Brought before Artegall for judgment, Sanglier defies his accuser, and testifies falsely that—

> neither he did shed that Ladies bloud
> Nor tooke away his love, but *his owne proper good.*

Then

> Well did the Squire perceive himself too weake,
> To aunswere his defiaunce in the field,
> And rather chose his challenge off to breake,
> Then to approve his right with speare and shield.
> And rather guilty chose him selfe to yield.[1]

Only by imitating Solomon is Artegall able to discover to whom the live Ladie belongs and who is the murderer. The other extreme is represented by Sanglier, the robber Pollente, his daughter Munera, the Gyant with the huge "ballance," and so on. Like Aristotle, Spenser puts the emphasis on the extreme of taking too much. The opposite of general Justice is represented by such characters as Grantorto (Great Wrong). The mean is seen in Artegall, Arthur, Britomart, and Mercilla (Equity).

The various phases of Justice discussed by Aristotle are clearly presented by Spenser, such as distributive justice, corrective justice, retaliation, equity, and so on. Spenser also plainly makes Reason the determiner of the mean in respect to Justice. See, for example, his literal exposition of Justice in V, ix, 1 ff.

Spenser's sixth virtue, Courtesy, is not only treated as a mean, but is exactly Aristotle's mean in regard to Friendliness. As we have already seen, Aristotle makes Friendliness consist in acting as a true friend would act.[2] He makes its extremes Surliness, Contentiousness, Unfriendliness, on the one hand, and Flattery and Obsequiousness, or Complaisance, on the other. His friendly man is pleasant to live with, for he is free from Surliness or Contentiousness; but he will not yield his approval or withhold his condemnation when wrong conduct is under consideration. This is why he is like a true friend. Here we have exactly the character of Spenser's Knight of Courtesy, as is shown, for example, by Spenser's literal exposition of Sir Calidore's Courtesy, in VI, i, 2–3. It is plain that the Blatant Beast,

[1] V, i, 23, 24.

[2] *N. Eth.*, IV, xii.

which Calidore, the Knight of Courtesy, is to bind, is one extreme in regard to Courtesy. Blandina[1] represents the opposite extreme. Calidore is, of course, the mean. Clearly Spenser puts the emphasis on Surliness, Contentiousness. We have already seen that Spenser develops the virtue of Courtesy by showing its opposites and by presenting various phases of the virtue and of its opposites. Further, that Reason is the determiner of the right course in regard to this virtue Spenser repeatedly makes clear. Enias, for example, appeals to Arthur, who here represents Courtesy, to rescue—

> Yond Lady and her Squire with foule despight
> Abusde, against all *reason* and all law.[2]

Thus I have shown, beyond question I hope, that Spenser follows Aristotle in essentials. Incidentally many correspondences in details have been pointed out, but lack of space makes it impossible to show how numerous such correspondences are.

At one point Spenser interprets his Aristotle with considerable freedom. He assigns Magnificence to Arthur, "which vertue," he says, "for that (according to Aristotle and the rest) it is the perfection of all the rest, and containeth in it them all," etc.[3] Jusserand, conceiving that there is no warrant in Aristotle for any such statement, says, "He follows here, as a matter of fact, neither Aristotle nor the rest."[4] Jusserand sees in Spenser's statement evidence that the poet's recollection of Aristotle was vague, and he finally intimates—what Professor Erskine, following him, states—that Spenser probably never had read Aristotle's *Ethics*.

Now suppose we could demonstrate that Spenser's memory did fail him at this point, that he actually was confused as to the Aristotelian meaning of Magnificence (μεγαλοπρέπεια). The fact would prove little. Greene,[5] Herford,[6] and others have proved that Spenser more than once forgot the thread of his own story in the *Faerie Queene*. If a slip in memory is evidence that Spenser knew little of, and had probably never read, Aristotle's *Ethics*, there is equal

[1] See especially VI, vi, 41–42.

[2] VI, viii, 6; see also VI, iii, 49.

[3] Letter to Sir Walter Raleigh.

[4] *Mod. Phil.*, III, 382.

[5] *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, IV, 173 ff.

[6] See Professor Child's edition of Spenser's poems, note to I, i, 52.

evidence that he knew little of, and had probably never read, the *Faerie Queene*. But there is no evidence that Spenser's memory did fail him at this point; and there is much evidence that it did not.

Let us see what authority exists in Aristotle for Spenser's assignment of Magnificence to the morally perfect Arthur. First we must decide what is Aristotle. Jusserand says: "Three treatises on morals have come down to us under the name of Aristotle; one alone, the *Nicomachean Ethics*, being, as it seems, truly his; the others appear to be a make-up, drawn from his teachings by some disciples."[1] This is a kind of *ex post facto* judgment. Frederich D. E. Schleiermacher, the great critic and Aristotelian scholar, born one hundred and seventy years after Spenser's death, held that the *Magna Moralia* was the source of the *Nicomachean Ethics* and of the *Eudemian Ethics*.[2] Only recently have scholars begun to agree that the *Nicomachean Ethics* is probably the most truly Aristotelian of the three. An uncritical scholar like Spenser would certainly have made no such distinction. He would simply have accepted all three as the teachings of Aristotle, as they really are.

There is ample warrant in Aristotle for the idea that one of the moral virtues may be thought of as containing all the others. For example, it is clear from the *Nicomachean Ethics* that Magnanimity (I have elsewhere used the term Highmindedness) would fill this requirement;[3] for although Magnanimity, or Highmindedness, is essentially love of great honor, it includes moral perfection in the fullest sense. Again, on the same authority Justice, in the broad sense, includes all the moral virtues so far as one's relations to others are concerned. But under Spenser's plan, set forth in the letter to Raleigh, the virtue assigned to Arthur could have no Book; and Spenser was too much interested in church matters and in politics not to write on Holiness and Justice. Besides, there would be a kind of impropriety in omitting the former; probably the Scripture text "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you" had something to do, not only with Spenser's writing on Holiness, but also with his treating it

[1] *Mod. Phil.*, III, 374.

[2] *The Works of Aristotle, Translated into English under the Editorship of W. D. Ross: Magna Moralia, Ethica Eudemia, De Virtutibus et Vitiis* (Oxford, 1915), Introd., p. v.

[3] *N. Eth.*, IV, vii, and II, vii.

first. It was highly desirable then to reserve Highmindedness, or Magnanimity, and Justice for what we know as the First and Fifth Books. (If, as Jusserand holds, Spenser had already written the Book on Holiness when he completed the plan set forth in his letter to Raleigh, it was absolutely necessary to leave Highmindedness, Magnanimity, as the virtue of the Knight of Holiness; for it would do admirably for him, and no other virtue would do.) Thus if Spenser could assign some other virtue to Arthur, he could make the plan of his poem more elastic.

Now there was another virtue which was peculiarly adapted to Arthur, provided it could be made to include all the virtues—namely, Magnificence. According to the *Nicomachean Ethics*, "Magnificence is suitable to . . . . persons of rank and reputation and the like, as all these advantages confer importance and dignity."[1] Rank? Arthur's was the highest. Reputation? Spenser tells us in the letter to Raleigh that it was because of Arthur's reputation that he chose him as the hero of the *Faerie Queene*, he "being made famous by many men's former works." Again, the magnificent man labors for the public good and strives for honor. Once more, "The motive of the magnificent man in incurring expense will be nobleness; for nobleness is a characteristic of all the virtues." "In a word, Magnificence is excellence of work on a great scale."[2] What could better describe Arthur's great works?

But can Magnificence be made to include all the virtues? Although in a strict sense it is simply a mean between meanness and vulgar display in the use of money, it seems to include much more. Moreover, there is, as we have already seen, abundant authority in the *Nicomachean Ethics* for taking the virtues not only in a strict but also in a broad or metaphorical sense. If Magnificence were similarly interpreted, it would be "the perfection of all the rest and contain in it them all." But all this is from the *Nicomachean Ethics*. What do Aristotle's other works on morals say about Magnificence? The *Magna Moralia* says: "But there are, as people think, more kinds of Magnificence than one; for instance, people say, 'His walk was Magnificent,' and there are of course other uses of the term

[1] IV, iv; II, vii.

[2] Cf. Aristotle's discussion of the magnificent man, *N. Eth.*, IV, iv–v.

Magnificent in a metaphorical, not in a strict, sense."[1] This is certainly suggestive. And according to the *Ethica Eudemia*, "The magnificent man is not concerned with any and every action or choice, but with expenditure—unless we use the term metaphorically."[2] Here is a plain suggestion that Magnificence could be taken in a broad sense, could be made to include "any and every action or choice." Such is Magnificence "according to Aristotle." Who "the rest" are is not quite clear, but Spenser's favorite poet, Chaucer, says in his *Persones Tale*, "Thanne comth Magnificence, that is to seyn, whan a man dooth and perfourneth grete werkes of goodnesse"[3] —exactly what Arthur "dooth."

We come now to Jusserand's third and last main argument. Jusserand contends that Spenser did not get his virtues from Aristotle and proceeds to argue that he did get them from his friend Lodowick Bryskett, and from Piccolomini's *Istitutione morale*, through Bryskett. He thus finds it necessary to get over Spenser's own assertion that he did take his virtues from Aristotle. He argues that "Spenser showed as a rule no minute accuracy in his indications of sources and models, and he did not display more than usual in this particular case."[4] The first part of the proposition is true. But to find that "as a rule" Spenser showed no "minute accuracy" is a vastly different thing from concluding that a solemn statement concerning the substance of his whole *Faerie Queene* is "misleading, every word of it."

Let us examine Jusserand's argument[5] that Spenser derived his virtues from Bryskett, and from Piccolomini through Bryskett. Long after Spenser's death Bryskett published *A Discourse of Civil Life*,[6] a translation from Giraldi Cinthio's three dialogues *Dell' allevare et ammaestrare i figluoli nella vita civile.* It is an account of the best way to *rear children* and includes a discussion of moral virtues in which the number twelve is mentioned. That Spenser knew this *Discourse* Jusserand concludes from the fact that Bryskett represents Spenser as one of the interlocutors in the conversation which furnishes the machinery of the book. Before the day of Spenser and Bryskett,

[1] I, xxvi.
[2] III, vi.
[3] 736 (§ 61).
[4] *Mod. Phil.*, III, 374.
[5] *Ibid.*, III, 378–80.
[6] London, 1606.

Piccolomini, taking Aristotle and Plato as his masters, had written his *Istitutione morale,* in which he discussed eleven moral virtues and added the statement that Prudence, which he classed as an intellectual virtue, might be considered a moral virtue. Jusserand holds that "twelve was a kind of sacred number and was sure to come in." In his *Discourse* Bryskett states that when he came to the question of the moral virtues he found that Cinthio had treated them "somewhat too briefly and confusedly" and adds, "I have therefore, to help mine own understanding, had recourse to Piccolomini."[1] Jusserand takes this statement as "positive testimony" that Spenser knew the substance of the *Istitutione morale.* Jusserand concludes: "From such books and such *conversations,* from other less solemn *talks* which he and Bryskett, interested in the same problems, could not fail to have, Spenser derived his *list of virtues* and his *ideas regarding a list of twelve.*"

Now it is quite possible that Spenser, the genius, should get his ideas from Lodowick Bryskett, a man of no great parts. It is also possible, however improbable, that Spenser read Bryskett's book twenty years before it was published. But there is no proof, or even evidence, that such was the case. And, by the same token, there is no evidence that Spenser knew Piccolomini's *Istitutione.* Professor Erskine has proved, what most careful students must already have suspected, that Bryskett's "conversation" which furnishes Jusserand's "positive testimony" is a myth. In putting his discussion into the form of a dialogue in which he himself, Spenser, the Bishop of Armagh, and others are the speakers, Bryskett is simply following a literary convention of the day. It is impossible to suppose all the characters of the dialogue actually together at Bryskett's cottage.[2] Besides, Erskine finds that the speeches which Bryskett puts into the mouths of Spenser and the good Bishop of Armagh are translated straight from Giraldi Cinthio. He finds further that even if the dialogue had been a real one it could have had little to do with Piccolomini, for it contains only one passage from him. It may be added that Bryskett could have taken the idea for the machinery of his *Discourse* from Spenser's *Mother Hubberds Tale.* In both cases

[1] *Mod. Phil.*, III, 378–80.

[2] *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XXIII, 831–50.

the author is sick, his friends come in to see him, and the conversation which is later given to the reader takes place. The only difference is that Bryskett is so anxious to take the credit of authorship that he commits the absurdity of having the sick man, Bryskett himself, do the talking, which consists in lecturing on philosophy for three days.

In the next place, even if Spenser had known Bryskett's *Discourse*, he could not have taken his virtues and the plan of his *Faerie Queene* from it. For one reason, Spenser's and Bryskett's virtues are unlike in nature. For example, Bryskett, like Plato, makes Prudence one of the moral virtues, whereas Spenser, as we have already seen, follows Aristotle in making it that intellectual virtue which determines the mean in the case of each of the moral virtues. Again, Bryskett makes Magnanimity a subordinate virtue, whereas Spenser, like Aristotle, makes it include all the moral virtues. Moreover, Spenser's basis of classification is quite different from Bryskett's. In Bryskett's classification, to quote his own words, "There are . . . . four principall vertues . . . . from which four are also derived (as branches from their trees) sundry others to make up the number twelve,"[1] whereas Spenser, like Aristotle, makes one of his virtues include all the others. Finally, even the agreement in point of number, which Jusserand would make much of, does not exist. Bryskett's number is twelve, Spenser's thirteen. And Spenser's plan of his poem, set forth in the letter to Raleigh, would have been impossible with any other number of virtues than thirteen. Thus it is plain that Spenser did not get his virtues from Bryskett.

WILLIAM FENN DEMOSS

NEBRASKA WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

[1] Quoted by Jusserand, *Mod. Phil.*, III, 380.

A NEW DATE FOR THE *CONQUEST OF GRANADA*

Scholars have made many surmises regarding the dates of the first performances of the two parts of Dryden's *Conquest of Granada.* The delimiting dates within which the two parts appeared are generally recognized as 1669—the year of production for *Tyrannic Love*—and February, 1670–71, when the *Conquest of Granada* was entered on the Stationers' books. Within these limits conjecture has been various, with a tendency to date the complete production early in the dramatic season of 1669–70.

A contemporary letter[1] now appears as proof that the second part was produced early in January, 1671. This letter, written by Lady Mary Bertie to her niece Katherine Noel, then at Exton, reads as follows:

> 1670[–71], January 2. Westminster—I have noe news to send you but that my brother Norreyss Act is passed both Houses, and I hope now it will not bee long beefore I see you at Exton. There is letely come out a new play writ by Mr. Dreyden who made the *Indian Emperor.* It is caled the *Conquest of Grenada.* My brother Norreys tooke a box and carryed my Lady Rochester and his mistresse and all us to[o], and on Tuestay wee are to goe see the second part of it which is then the first tim acted. I am suere you would bee with us if wishes could bring you. My sister Osborine and all heare are well and all my brothers. Here was the Duke of Buckingham and a greate deale of company dind here to-day.

From this statement it is clear that the latest date intended for the staging of Part II would be January 9, 1671. As to Part I, only conjecture seems possible; yet since in Lady Bertie's last previous letter, dated December 10, 1670, no mention was made of the play, it probably appeared between that date and the close of the year, possibly during the Christmas festivities. Genest's argument is to the point here; he wrote,[2] "They who had seen the 1st part, would naturally be inclined to see the 2nd—and they who had not seen the 1st, would not easily understand the 2nd." The dates may fairly be set as between December 20, 1670, and January 9, 1671.

[1] *Hist. MSS. Com.*, XII, App. 5, p. 22.

[2] *Some Account of the English Stage*, etc., I, 101.

This new fact clears up Dryden's meaning in the Epilogue of Part I, where he asks his audience to

> Think him not duller for this year's delay;

he is obviously begging pardon for postponing the presentation of the *Conquest of Granada*, and the reason is not far to seek. Dryden asserts that the men were ready, but the women ill; then he adds:

> And pity us, your servants, to whose cost,
> In one such sickness, nine whole months are lost.

Here the allusion is to Nell Gwyn, mistress of Charles II, who gave birth to Charles Beauclerk on May 8, 1670. This evident explanation suits the facts far better than the view that "this year's delay" goes back to the staging of *Tyrannic Love*, in 1669, and that thus Part I was presented early in 1670.

Critics have already thrown doubt upon the tradition that Nell Gwyn won the king by her rendition of the Prologue of the *Conquest of Granada*, Part I. Inasmuch as she did not speak it until several months after the birth of her son, it is more credible that Charles II was led on by hearing her in *Tyrannic Love*. This is the assertion of the publisher Curll.

The letter, however, has its most important interest for the student of Buckingham's *Rehearsal*, first presented on December 7, 1671. Since the Duke was in Westminster in January, 1671, he was more than likely present at the first performance of Part II. In such case he would have ample chance after seeing this play to rework the unfinished stage satire of his *Rehearsal* before the next dramatic season. With an interval of less than a year between the two plays, instead of two years according to former computations, the *Rehearsal* was making satiric hits at lines and situations still fresh in the minds of London audiences.

LEONARD DELONG WALLACE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

A Woman Killed with Kindness and *The Fair Maid of the West.* By Thomas Heywood. Edited by Katharine Lee Bates. (The Belles-Lettres Series.) Boston, New York, and Chicago: D. C. Heath & Co., 1917. 12mo, pp. cxiv+300.

In the Introduction to her edition of Thomas Heywood's *A Woman Killed with Kindness* and *The Fair Maid of the West,* Miss Bates devotes her attention almost solely to biographical and bibliographical matters. This is a happy departure from the accepted custom of the Belles-Lettres Series, for Heywood stands greatly in need of just such a study, and his editor could not have rendered students of the drama a better service. In more than one hundred closely printed pages she records all that at present is known of Heywood's life, and discusses in some detail all of his works, both dramatic and non-dramatic. For this full summary, executed with scholarly care, students of Heywood will be sincerely grateful.

Two of the additions which Miss Bates has been able to make to the slender biography of the poet deserve special mention. In the parish registers of St. James, Clerkenwell, she discovered the entry of Heywood's death in 1641, thus disposing of the notion that he lived on well through the period of the Commonwealth. And in the Probate Registry of Somerset House she found the will of Heywood's beloved uncle, Edmund, "that good old man" who probably inspired most of the hospitable and noble-minded personages in the plays. The will, which is pleasant reading, not only records a bequest to "Thomas Heywoode and his wief," but in a most intimate way brings us into the circle of the poet's own family.

Of the biographical material discovered by other scholars Miss Bates has missed very little. She seems, however, not to be aware of the lawsuit which in 1623 Gervase Markham brought against Heywood and thirty-eight other defendants, mostly actors. The documents in the case were printed by Mr. Wallace in the Shakespeare *Jahrbuch,* XLVI, 345. In these the place of Heywood's residence is several times given with legal precision as "neare Clarkenwell Hill, in the Parish of St. James." Here he seems to have lived for many years, and from this parish he was buried in 1641.

In her discussion of the various plays that have been assigned to Heywood by modern scholars Miss Bates shows a sound judgment issuing from an intimate knowledge of the dramatist's mental and stylistic qualities. She says: "Mr. Bullen's tentative ascription to Heywood of *Dick of Devonshire* may be set aside, as well as the suggestion that Heywood was part author of

Pericles"; and of Mr. Sieveking's attribution to him of *Worke for Cutlers* she remarks: "Subject, manner, phrasing, all are against this." To the same conclusions, if I may be allowed to say so, I came independently after a long and careful study of these plays for the sole purpose of detecting the hand of Heywood. Of *The Merry Devil of Edmonton* Miss Bates thinks that "touches of the Heywood vocabulary are in evidence, as well as the Heywood flavor." This too accords with the result of my own detailed examination of that play. Heywood, however, cannot be thought of as the chief author of *The Merry Devil;* the unmistakable hand of Thomas Dekker is to be found in most of the scenes. After stating that "strong cases have been made out for *How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad, A Warning for Fair Women, Appius and Virginia,* and scenes of *Sir Thomas Stukeley,*" she designates *The Isle of Dogs* as "more doubtful." This is unfortunate, for the authorship and history of that interesting play are now fully known. See E. K. Chambers, *Modern Language Review,* IV, 407, 511; R. B. McKerrow, *The Works of Thomas Nashe,* V, 29; C. W. Wallace, *Englische Studien,* XLIII, 340; and Adams, *Shakespearean Playhouses,* p. 170.

The detailed record of Heywood's many non-dramatic works is not the least valuable section of the Introduction. Deserving of special notice is the discovery in the British Museum of one of his broadsides, "Three Wonders of This Age," hitherto unknown; and the very plausible identification of his "booke called Mistakes, Clinches, Tales, &c." (which John Okes entered in the Stationers' Registers on November 18, 1636), with *A New Book of Mistakes, or Bulls with Tales, and Buls without Tales, But no lyes by any means,* published by Nicholas Okes (the father of John) in 1637. This pleasant little collection of jests has sometimes been assigned to Robert Chamberlain, but apparently for no good reason. In discussing Heywood's "Epistle," printed at the end of *An Apology for Actors,* Miss Bates says: "It is not evident what it is that Shakespeare, 'to do himselfe right,' had 'since published . . . . in his owne name.'" The language of the "Epistle," though awkward, is perfectly clear. The public might suppose that Heywood, in his *Britain's Troy,* had stolen two poems from Shakespeare, and that shortly afterward Shakespeare, "to do himselfe right," had claimed these poems by inserting them in the third edition of *The Passionate Pilgrim.* Since the whole passage is significant in its bearing on Shakespeare, a clear interpretation is imperative.

The text of *A Woman Killed with Kindness* is reproduced from a copy of the second (and best) quarto, 1617, owned by Professor George P. Baker, of Harvard; and the text of *The Fair Maid of the West* is reproduced from a copy of the first (and only) quarto, 1631, in the Barton Collection of the Boston Public Library. So far as one can judge, these texts are reproduced with the proper care, and the more significant variant readings in other editions both ancient and modern have been recorded in footnotes. But one

may complain that no attempt has been made in either case to collate the particular Boston copy selected for reproduction with other copies of the same edition. It would have been desirable to collate these copies with the copies in the British Museum, or in the Bodleian Library, or with both. The value of collating two or more copies of an early edition is well known, and the need in the case of at least one of these plays seems to be clear. For example, Collier, in his edition of *The Fair Maid of the West*, states that in the particular copy he reproduces there is no heading prefixed to the list of persons, yet Miss Bates finds in the Barton copy the heading "Dramatis Personae," and the possibility of other variant readings is at least suggested by her notes on Collier's text.

The absence of a discussion of the dates of composition for the two plays is possibly due to the fact that the Introduction concerns itself with a general study of Heywood. Miss Bates, however, assumes that the date of composition for *The Fair Maid of the West* coincides with the date of publication (see, for example, the note to p. 169, l. 58); but most scholars, with good reason, I think, favor a date nearer to 1604. The question is too important to be thus ignored.

Probably for the same reason no attempt has been made to sketch the history of the plays subsequent to their publication. Yet this is both interesting and important for a full appreciation of the plays, and room for it might have been found somewhere. The history of *The Fair Maid of the West* has been traced by Professor Ross Jewell in *Studies in English Drama*, edited by Allison Gaw, 1917. The history of *A Woman Killed with Kindness* is probably even more interesting. The play was reworked by Victor as *The Fatal Error*, printed in the second volume of his *Miscellanies*, 1776. It has also been several times revived with notable success, for example, in London in 1887 and in New York in 1914.

The Notes are scholarly throughout, and judiciously chosen, though of course one might here and there add a comment. Thus, in the address "To the Reader," prefixed to *The Fair Maid of the West*, Heywood says: "Curteous Reader, my plaies have not beene exposed to the publike view of the world in numerous sheets and a large volume." The allusion is to the publication of Jonson's plays with the title *Workes*. Heywood makes the same complaint in his address "To the Reader," prefixed to *The English Traveller*, 1633: "True it is, that my Playes are not exposed vnto the world in Volumes, to beare the titles of Workes (as others)." Nor was Heywood the only one to gibe at Ben's vanity. From among numerous such passages I may quote two. John Suckling, in "A Session of the Poets," writes:

> The first that broke Silence was good old Ben,
> Prepar'd before with Canary Wine;
> And he told them plainly he deserved the Bayes,
> For his were call'd Works, where others were but Plays.

And the author of *Wits Recreations* writes:

> Pray tell me, Ben, where doth the mystery lurk,
> What others call a play, you call a work.

But, of course, of the making of notes there is no end.

The Bibliography is in two sections, of which the first, labeled "Texts," records all the editions of the two plays. We notice the omission of Professor Neilson's reprint of *A Woman Killed with Kindness* in *The Chief Elizabethan Dramatists*, 1911. The second section, labeled "Biographical and Critical Works," constitutes an invaluable general bibliography of Heywood. A special feature is the inclusion of every known allusion to Heywood before the end of the seventeenth century.

The following items should be added:

1633. *Histrio-Mastix.* William Prynne. [Add "A reference to Heywood, p. 722."]

1636. *Annalia Dubrensia.* [There was also a reprint by E. R. Vyvyan in 1878.]

1832. *Some Account of the English Stage from the Restoration in 1660 to 1830.* John Genest. Bath. [Contains accounts of revivals of Heywood's plays.]

1880. "Documents Relating to the Players at the Red Bull, Clerkenwell, and the Cockpit in Drury Lane, in the Time of James I." J. Greenstreet. [In *The New Shakspere Society Transactions* (1880–86), p. 489. Also in the *Athenæum*, February 21, 1885; and in F. G. Fleay's *A Chronicle History of the London Stage*, 1890.]

1887. "Thomas Heywood, Dramatist." Lionel G. Cresswell. *Book-Lore*, VI, 7.

1896–1904. *Histoire littéraire du peuple anglais.* J. J. Jusserand. Paris.

1904. *Die Italienische Novelle im Englischen Drama von 1600 bis zur Restauration.* Adèle Ott. Zurich. [Discusses the source of *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, and other plays by Heywood.]

1909. *Geschichte des neueren Dramas.* W. Creizenach. Halle. [An English translation by Cécile Hugon, London, 1916.]

1909. *Elizabethan Drama. Notes and Studies.* J. LeGay Brereton. Sydney. [Notes on the texts of Thomas Heywood, pp. 128–41.]

1910. "Gervase Markham, Dramatist." C. W. Wallace. The Shakespeare *Jahrbuch*, XLVI, 345. [Documents relating to a lawsuit in which Heywood is one of the defendants.]

1913. *Englands Parnassus.* Edited by Charles Crawford. Oxford. [Important notes on Heywood, pp. xxxi, 509, 529.]

1917. "Heywood's *Fair Maid of the West.*" Ross Jewell. [In *Studies in English Drama* (edited by Allison Gaw, New York), p. 62. This study appeared after Miss Bates's work had gone to the press.]

Let us hope that before long students of the Tudor-Stuart drama will be provided with a complete and definitive edition of the plays of our "prose Shakespeare." Toward the production of such an edition Miss Bates's admirable study will contribute much.

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

A Literary Middle English Reader. Edited by ALBERT S. COOK. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1915. Pp. xxviii+554.

As frankly avowed by the title, this Middle English reader differs from all its predecessors in proposing to furnish a body of texts, not for linguistic, but for literary, study. The object of the editor is to make accessible and intelligible a diversified group of poetical or prose works of each of the chief types of mediaeval vernacular English literature: romances, tales, chronicles, stories of travel, religious and didactic pieces, illustrations of life and manners, translations, lyrics, and plays. The material is classified under these headings, and even under each heading it is not arranged according to dialect or chronology.

In order to reduce to a minimum the apparatus which must intervene between student and text, the linguistic information is reduced to eight pages on pronunciation, inflection, and dialects. There are no linguistic notes, and there is no separate glossary, but the difficult words or forms are defined in footnotes, with a reference number from word to note. The texts on the whole are emended conservatively, and the manuscript readings are given in footnotes. At the head of each selection is the essential information about date, manuscripts, and editions; frequently a statement of problems or discussions; a summary of the whole work (if only an extract is printed); and some characterization of the literary value of the selection. On pages xxvi–xxviii is printed a short but admirably selected list of "Useful Books for the Study of Middle English."

Probably there are no two persons familiar with Middle English literature who would agree on the choice of material for such a volume; and in any event neither adverse criticism nor positive suggestion could now alter the contents. On the whole, the selections give an adequate idea of the kinds of people in England to whom literature in English appealed between 1200 and 1500; a fair view of the diverse forms that that literature assumed; and some knowledge of the skill, and of the lack of it, exhibited by English poets and prose-writers of that period. Chaucer is drawn on rather heavily; Gower is represented; extracts are given from *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight,* from the *Pearl,* and from *Piers the Plowman;* five plays are printed entire. The book gives us a body of fresh and unhackneyed material, duplicating next to nothing of the contents of other books of the same

character. Whatever of striking literary importance is not included (for example, *The Debate between the Body and the Soul*) is accessible in other generally used readers, such as Emerson, or Morris and Skeat.

The editor's effort briefly to characterize mediaeval vernacular literature is not especially felicitous, particularly the analogy with Gothic architecture. In the case of Middle English literature two considerations should be emphasized. First, before the year 1300 practically all the persons in England who read (or listened to) learned or polite literature demanded literature in Latin or in French. Two consequences ensued: most of the vernacular literature that existed probably was of a low standard, appealing, as it did, only to the uncultivated classes; and very little vernacular literature got written down, for parchment, vellum, and scribal labor were fairly expensive, putting the product beyond the reach of the "vernacular public." Since there was no market for manuscripts in the vernacular, few such manuscripts were produced. Therefore few of the works in English that did exist before 1300 have been preserved.

Second, in the case of that Middle English literature that has survived from both the early and the late periods, we do not confine our study to the best or to the pure literature, but we have overgenerously applied the term "literature" to practically every extant document written within the period in the English language. Some of these works are not "literature" at all. They were produced through a period of three hundred years, for all sorts of purposes and publics, with constantly changing technique, by writers who exhibited skill and power in varying degrees.

It would of course be absurd to imply that the technique of dramatic and narrative forms, for example, has not changed greatly since 1500. But any attempt to characterize such changes briefly, as well as any attempt to describe briefly the other and greater differences between mediaeval and modern literature as a whole, is in the nature of the case utterly impossible.

There are a few glosses in the book that might be improved: *þin erende to bede* (13. 10) = "to announce thy message;" *also* (16. 3) = "thus;" *anonder* (16. 27) = "one under;" *were* (17. 1) = "wear;" *let* (19. 15) = "left;" *everi del* (26. 25) = "every bit," i.e., every bit of their talk was about Havelok; *red* (31. 15) = "help;" *unkyndelike* (33. 4) = "unnaturally;" *al so, al so* (33. 7) = "as, as;" *let* (39.4) = "caused (to);" *for the nones* (47. 22) = "expressly" (see Hinckley, *Notes on Chaucer*, p. 28); *lak* (199. 10) = "fault," "blame."

Some emendations are unnecessary: MS *with* (24. 19) = *wiht*, "strong;" MS *was werse* (27. 25) needs no transposition; [*and*] (30. 15) is not required.

The best text in print has not always been followed. The extracts from the "Bestiary" are based on Mätzner, *Altenglische Sprachproben*, though

Morris has a more recent and much more accurate print of the manuscript in the *Old English Miscellany* (E.E.T.S., 49). An inspection of the latter would have enabled the editor to avoid the errors in footnotes 12, 13, 19, p. 318; 16, p. 319; 21, p. 320.

Thomas A. Knott

University of Chicago

Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit; Euphues & his England. By John Lyly. Edited by Morris W. Croll and Harry Clemons. London: George Routledge & Sons; New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1916. Pp. lxiv+473.

Professor Croll in his new edition of *Euphues*—with a modernized text prepared largely by Mr. Clemons—succeeds through the introduction and notes in throwing fresh light on this much-studied pioneer work of the English Renaissance. In the notes many new sources and influences, especially of English proverbial lore, are traced for particular passages. In the introduction adequate attention is for the first time called to the influence exerted on the Euphuistic type of style by mediaeval rhetoric with its *schemata*, and thus an excellent corrective is furnished to previous studies, which have recently focused attention too exclusively on the contribution of humanism to Euphuism. Such a treatment lays the basis for a better understanding of the fact that Lyly, like Spenser, contributed to the outburst of creative literature in England by aiding in the amalgamation of mediaeval culture with the newly revived classical culture, and particularly by following in the wake of Italy, where already the amalgamation had produced a literature in harmony with the social life of the period. I have urged elsewhere that Lyly's plays show a modification of court-of-love allegory by Platonism and of mediaeval pageantry by a new romantic classicism, and that even the didactic *Anatomy of Wit* is typical of the combined influences at work in the writings of Lyly (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXVII, 147–52; *Mod. Phil.*, XIV, 483–84). Professor Croll here emphasizes sufficiently the mediaevalism in the style of *Euphues*. But his emphasis of this tends to obscure the fact that the mediaeval tradition was practically absorbed in the new humanism. In drawing an unwarrantably sharp distinction between mediaeval and humanistic ideals of rhetoric, he neglects to point out how often a leading humanist like Erasmus overemphasizes rhetoric and recommends the more famous mediaeval rhetorics for study. In stressing the hostility of the humanists to the *schemata*, he does not trace the various degrees of purism among the men influenced by the New Learning or point out that his best exemplar, Wilson, belonged to a group of admirers of the simplicity of Demosthenes' style. In citing Ascham, another of this group, Professor

Croll has to admit that in certain types of work Ascham uses an ornate style; but even then he fails to realize that, guided by the contemporary laws of decorum, one must seek the immediate models for the style of Lyly's social romance in the non-didactic literature of the age. His mistake arises from accepting with Feuillerat *The Anatomy of Wit* as belonging, on account of its didacticism, with the works of Ascham and others of the puristic school, though he correctly traces the kinship of Lyly's style to that of other courtly writers (Puttenham furnishes an excellent uncited example of the long hold of mediaeval rhetoric on the court group). Professor Croll's conception of the nature of *The Anatomy* also leads him to overemphasize the influence of Ascham on the educational ideals of Lyly without showing how near Lyly is to the ideals of the Italian courtesy books in his treatment of social life, wit, etc. To Ascham he traces also the "bourgeois" spirit of *Euphues*, but he neglects the general humanistic conception of "gentility" most often discussed by the courtesy books. A somewhat similar lack of perspective seems to me to be shown in the emphasis on proverbs, which, like the maxims of "Cato" and similes from bestiaries, are simply one form of "amplification" by "precept and example" and an even less significant one than examples from Pliny's natural history or classical "sentences" and illustrations.

C. R. BASKERVILL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

57

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVI *October 1918* NUMBER 6

STUDIES IN THE MIND OF ROMANTICISM

I. ROMANTIC MOTIVES OF CONDUCT IN CONCRETE DEVELOPMENT

THE LETTERS OF HEINRICH VON KLEIST TO WILHELMINE VON ZENGE

Romanticism as such is not limited to any particular age or nation or condition of culture. It is one of a few fundamental frames of mind and is characteristic of a certain type of intelligence. No epoch in the history of civilization has been without its Romantic phase. The most important manifestation of Romanticism in modern history was the Romantic movement, which began in England and France in the eighteenth century and reached its culmination in Germany in the last generation of the eighteenth and the first generation of the nineteenth century. It is the purpose of the present series of studies to scrutinize afresh a number of fundamental factors in the Romantic view and conduct of life, in the hope of advancing, by scrupulous discernment of that which is specific and characteristic, the understanding of Romanticism.

Romanticism, in extreme consistency, is subjective monism. It assumes that the primary reality is exclusively inherent—or, in the view of its more moderate advocates, exclusively cognizable—in the "inner" consciousness, which manifests itself in acts of immediate apperception or intuition. This "inner" consciousness is the

Romantic essence of personality. It is spiritual in quality, being, in fact, regarded as an integral part of the spirit of God.[1]

This inner being, like objective reality, has three principal parts, the intellectual, the emotional, and the ethical. Its intellectual organ is the "soul" or "spirit." These two terms among the Romanticists are interchangeable. The emotional part is embodied in the "heart"; the ethical in the "absolute freedom" of the will.

The term *Vernunft*, meaning the "highest reason," occurs frequently in Romantic speech. It is always interpreted as incompatible with the *Verstand*, the analytic understanding, the specific organ of the rationalism of the "enlightenment," archfoe of Romanticism; and is superior to it. In Romanticism the *Vernunft* is the supreme faculty of intelligence, uniting all the parts of the "inner" being in immediate synthetic apperception. The Romantic *Vernunft* is thus the intelligent faculty in which the "soul," the "heart," and the "absolute will" attain identity. This use of *Vernunft*, apart from the Romantic development of the term "emotion," one of the constituents of *Vernunft*, is fundamentally not so much a perversion of Kantian terminology as one might suppose at first glance.

The paradox of absolute totalistic identities and absolute essential differences, mutually inherent in these primary terms of Romanticism, which is characteristic of this or any other monism, leads to the peculiar shiftiness and the topical paucity and false simplicity of its theories.

In Romantic literary practice *Vernunft* is not essentially differentiated from "soul," "heart," or "freedom." But on account of its ancient rationalistic pedigree it is much less used than the other terms. The "soul," whose terminological pedigree is unbroken, is generally employed as the agent of the total, spontaneous consciousness of the inner being.

The "inner" being, in all and in any of its terms, including *Vernunft*, finds its complete embodiment in "Nature." And in the same manner in which the individual "soul" or "spirit" is an integral part of the "soul" or "spirit" of God, the over-soul, each individual "nature" is an integral part of the universal nature. Likewise the absolute primacy of the universal or divine spirit in its relation to

[1] Cf. Emerson's essay on "Compensation."

universal nature is repeated in the primacy of each individual spirit in relation to its individual nature. Nature is thus the symbol of the soul. Romanticism is nature animism. It follows from this that "nature" offers the complete and sufficient tangible evidence of the soul. The laws of nature, therefore, must be the laws of the inner being. Nature embodies and manifests all the fundamental truths, motives, and standards of conduct.

Nature thus, in the Romantic view, is not primarily part of external or objective reality, but merely the outer or sense-form of the "inner" or spiritual reality. It is inner being in terms of sense. "Nature" and "inner," or "inmost" being become interchangeable. Organic functions and spiritual emotions become identical. Spiritual integrity becomes a term of organic totality, and vice versa. "Organic" and "intrinsic" become synonymous terms. All the organic properties of the nature of sense are immediately transferable, by symbolic metathesis, to the integral motives of the inner being, and vice versa.

Integrity is to the mind of the Romanticist the quality of only those acts which are the immediate resultants of the spontaneous push of the totality of his nature. This totality is beyond the analytic understanding, a mystic force, amenable only to the immediate apperception and expression of the soul. Its specific manifestation is its indissoluble spontaneous oneness of impulse. Only in complete loyalty and obedience to spontaneous impulse does the Romanticist acknowledge and follow the supreme law of his and in that of universal being. In this sense integrity to him is complete naturalness. The Romanticist denies original sin; he asserts original godliness.

The supreme authority and integrity of impulse implies freedom from external, objective, mediate motives or standards of truth and conduct. "Nature" thus becomes the warrant for the exclusion of any objective force or factor at variance with spontaneous desire; of any external demand for adaptation or restraint; of any call from the environment for subjective submission to objective ends. It becomes the ultimate title for the glorification of the withdrawal into self-centered states of mind. It is the realm of an absolutely egocentric view of life.

This definition of the nature and scope of the inner being, characteristic of Romanticism, determines a corresponding definition of the opposite, external, or objective reality as a whole and in all its parts and properties. This is by the Romanticists called the "world." The intellectual organ of the "world," the understanding (*Verstand*), the chief faculty of rationalism, is therefore, by the Romantic intensification of its terms, interpreted as the absolute opposite and antagonist of the "soul." It does not act by the immediate, totalistic, spontaneous unity of self-awareness, characteristic of the soul, but by indirect, analytic, critical isolation of elements. Its method is atomistic and quantitative, whereas that of Romanticism is unitarian and qualitative. Intellectually, thus, the "world" is identified and condemned with rationalism. The Romantic ban includes all the works, records, means of expression, characteristic of the "world," especially science and books recording knowledge.

Emotionally the "world" is negative; it is "cold"; without "heart." Ethically the term "world," meaning the sum of the external or objective will, marks the Romantic assumption of the absolute disparateness and irreconcilable antagonism between that and the inner, subjective will. Owing, further, to the central animism of the Romantic view, all the terms and antitheses are personified into living forces and conflicts.

In the conception of the "world" there reappears the fundamental Romantic paradox. Theoretically, on the Romantic assumption of the primacy of the subjective being, the "world" must be discovered ultimately as the creation of that being. The "world," too, must consistently be the child of the Romantic "soul" and not a changeling from nowhere, as Romanticism pretends. But, practically, there *are* the concrete actualities of the "world," which will not yield to any theoretic trumpets of Jericho. The "world" *does* act in opposition to the essence of the "soul." Compromise is impossible. If allowed to remain in the temple of the inner being, the "world" must destroy the totalistic integrity of the "soul."[1] If, then, the paradox will not yield to intellectual light, it will have to yield to naïve

[1] Cf. the priest's two speeches on concentration and integrity (ll. 946–70 and 979–96) in Grillparzer's *Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen*.

Cf. my edition of the drama, Introduction, pp. xxiv–lxiv; lxix–lxxxi (2d ed., Henry Holt & Co., 1914).

emotional heat. The "world" is offensive to the inner being, and so it becomes a term of reproach. It has nothing in common with "nature"; it is in no wise a symbol of the spirit; it is in no way a tabernacle of God. It is the embodiment of the evil principle, which acts in all that is external, objective, analytic, mechanistic, quantitative. It is the living body of rationalism, the veritable devil of Romantic mythology.

We are now approaching the chief details pertaining to each of the three main parts of Romanticism—the intellectual, the emotional, and the ethical. The last one, involving the motives and standards of conduct, is treated in this paper. The remaining two, which will be seen in the Romantic view to be inseparable, are the subject of the last paper of this series.

The primary Romantic assumption implies that motives and standards of conduct are to be interpreted as motives and forms of *Gefühl*, or emotion. But that is not definite enough. Emotion is not in itself Romantic, nor does it necessarily become so even by filling, under certain circumstances, the entire field of vision. "Gefühl ist Alles," the principal Romantic axiom, is not as such exclusively Romantic. It may be part of other views of life. The phrase holds, for instance, an important place in the first part of *Faust*, which is, for reasons presently to be indicated, not essentially Romantic.

It follows that the Romantic quality of motives and standards of conduct must be found in specific implications of the term *Gefühl*, or emotion. The emotions, as to their content, include sense-perceptions, both as "percepts" and "constructs," and emotions in the narrower sense. The latter can be divided into aesthetic emotions, passions, and affections. The sense-perceptions and the aesthetic emotions are wholly unethical. They imply no personal relations of their subject to any other person. They are conceivable in a universe in which only one intelligent being exists. Their quality, even in its relations to the "inner" consciousness, is fundamentally sensational. The passions and affections, on the other hand, imply relations between kindred intelligent beings. The former are those in which the ego-centric interests dominate; the affections those in which the ego-centric interests are subordinate to interests of other intelligences. The passions and affections,

therefore, though they too functionally rest on a sensational basis, are, as regards their contents and characters, determined by ethical relations and values.

The latter two groups of emotions undergo specific changes in Romanticism. By virtue of the Romantic assumption of the totalistic identity of inner being, "nature," and integrity of impulse, man, even in his relations with other kindred beings, must act as if the universe held no other primary intelligence except him. Everyone, besides him, is, not only in place and time but in essence, non-ego. Any external influence upon his motives would be not only a disturbance but a vital hurt. It would produce *Gefühlsverwirrung*, confusion of emotion. This *Gefühlsverwirrung* is the chief tragic factor in Kleist's principal dramas. He traces it invariably to the interference of the "understanding," the mind of the "world."

This separation of the inner life from external reality, this absolute solipsism, brings about the sense of solitude, which is a favorite theme of Romantic literature and art. It is an object both of sincerest sorrow and pride.

Romanticism, by divesting the passions and emotions of ethical quality, strips them also of spiritual character. By turning them into pure "nature" it identifies their essence with that of the sense-perceptions and aesthetic emotions.[1] Their substance likewise is sensational. The "heart" is identical both with the aesthetic sense and with the instinctive desire; sympathy, with sensitiveness.

The totalistic conception of impulse limits spontaneity to a passive function. Romantic spontaneity is spontaneity without initiative. It is, indeed, the "treasure of the humble."

Moral freedom offers an analogous limitation. The Romanticists cling to the absolute primacy of the inner being because that assumption alone seems to vouchsafe, in the absolute sovereignty of the will, unlimited moral freedom. But freedom of conduct is freedom of motive, which implies active spontaneity, i.e., spontaneity with absolute initiative. The spontaneity of Romanticism proves to be a tragic mockery. It destroys the substance of the will, freedom, and morality. It is pure fatalism of impulse. The objective will, the

[1] The age-old confusion of the aesthetic with the artistic and poetic emotions has received an additional support from Romantic sensationalism. See the last essay of this series.

hated "world," is actually not the dungeon of freedom, but its only secular fortress. Beyond that there is no protection save the theological grace. Romantic "will" at the moment of clutching at its grail of absolute freedom plunges into the uttermost abyss of enslavement to its first cause, its "nature," or general disposition. The axiom, "Temperament is fate," coined by Romanticism, by the paradoxical irony inherent in the Romantic philosophy, is its verdict upon its own chief shortcoming.

As regards ethical standards, the necessary consequence of the Romantic emotional totalism is ethical relativism. The assertion that everything is right which is in accordance with the individual impulse finds its complement in the denial that anything else can be right. And further, since, in their view, the moral value is nothing but a foreordained second to impulse, why should it claim any attention? Romanticism thus becomes ethical indifferentism, which in its final form is moral nihilism.[1]

These are the specifically Romantic ethical elements of *Gefühl* in their extreme form. They do not always appear in that form, but even in the moderately Romantic works they are sufficiently defined to reveal the type.

It is now evident why the use of the axiom "Gefühl ist Alles" in *Faust* is not Romantic. The fundamental ethical problem of *Faust* is the active adjustment of the individual impulse to the "world." The morality of the *dunkle Drang*,[2] which is equivalent to the Romantic totalistic impulse, is not absolute, as in Romanticism, but conditioned by the "goodness" of the individual. This goodness can be interpreted only, and in *Faust* is interpreted, in relation to objective ethical standards, regarded not only as independent of subjective desires but as more universal and superior. Goethe sought conciliation between subjective being and objective reality; the Romanticists sought the absolute domination of the former. A Romantic Faust could support no two natures within himself. His second "nature" would have produced only *Gefühlsverwirrung*, and invited, not as in Goethe's work, harmonization with the first, or subjective, nature, but

[1] As illustrated in Tieck's *William Lovell*.

[2] "Ein guter Mensch in seinem dunklen Drange
Ist sich des rechten Weges wohl bewusst."

its own ruthless annihilation. A Romantic Faust could not seek atonement by making himself part of the "world," but only by the opposite course of isolating himself from it.[1]

The one-sidedness of Romanticism thus forces it ultimately into the identification of character with temperament, of emotion with sensation. (There is no good reason against the use of the term "sensation" to cover the "outer" as well as the "inner" sense-perceptions in whatever stage of literalness or generalization. The term lays the proper stress upon the unity of the process as well as the content.) By another ironic paradox, such as is inherent in any one-sided assumption, the men who aspired to become the specialists of the soul became the specialists of sense.[2] Spiritualism once more turned into sensualism. Extremes not only meet but interchange essences.

Romanticism has for its province the portrayal, *sub specie sensus*, under the aspect of sense, of the emotions, from the most violent passions to the softest and subtlest intimations, complexities, and fluctuations of moods, dreams, and fancies. The failures resulting from its fundamental limitations, its weakness of character, moral futility, lack of initiative and of sense of reality, unsteadiness of balance, are obvious in its products. Its devotees tend to lose themselves in trivial and even degenerate absorption and experiments in sensations for their own sake or go astray on the barren paths of mere aestheticism and introspection rather than choose truly creative activities; and frequently they end their lives as secluded and desiccated egoists. But the best minds among them have, in compensation for their one-sidedness, succeeded in tracing, with unsurpassed sensitiveness, consistency, and finesse, the marvelously rich and complex courses which the senses take among the motives of conduct. They have the merits, as much as the faults, of their virtuosity.

Every theoretic conclusion relative to life, however consistent, requires concrete verification. The abstract reasons governing Romantic ethics must take on the flesh and blood of concrete motives of conduct to prove their meaning and validity. Such substantiation

[1] This problem is further discussed in the fourth paper of this series.

[2] Fr. Schlegel's *Lucinde*, which won the enthusiastic praise even of the youthful Schleiermacher, is an example of this confusion.

has encountered great obstacles in modern Romanticism. The lives of the founders of the First Romantic School, the fathers of modern Romanticism, were too private and too detached to leave many direct and substantial traces at the present time. Their literary products, on the other hand, consist largely of theoretic interpretations of their literary intentions and valuations. Since, however, theoretic self-analysis is the office of the understanding and not of the synthetic emotion, it is apparent that the main body of Romantic works, with a characteristic though unconscious paradoxical irony, is a direct reversal of the doctrine primarily actuating it, namely, the doctrine of the "superiority" of the *Gefühl* over the *Verstand* and the consequent necessity of displacing the latter throughout with the former. Instead of subordinating the understanding to emotion, the first Romantic school actually established the understanding in a new rôle of ascendancy. Rationalism, though putting emotion in the second rank, had left it to its own devices within that rank. But Romanticism, while taking the field as the champion of emotion, labored early and late to force its mistress under the theoretic yoke of the understanding. It was in this respect more rationalistic than rationalism. This misunderstanding of its own fundamental motive, which is especially conspicuous in the works of Friedrich Schlegel and of Schelling, accounts for the paucity of its original substance. The very important creative achievement of Romanticism, which covers every field of literature, belongs to a later period, and to minds whose essential Romanticism was considerably qualified by varying degrees of open-mindedness to objective reality.

The few significant creative works of early Romanticism, among which those of Novalis and the youthful Tieck are the most important, are generally so dominated by theoretic intentions, so pervaded with *Tendenz*, so rigid with analytic self-consciousness, that they largely are rather obvious allegories of rationalistic preconceptions.

It is unfortunate that the critical essays, self-analytic fragments, and clever but vexatious and inconclusive aperçus of the early Romanticists have absorbed the larger part of the attention given to this important movement, especially by academic writers. "Glossant glossas, et glossarum glossas." An inquiry which limits itself chiefly to the theoretic self-interpretation of a creative movement

can never grasp more than that part of it which speaks in its theories. In the case of Romanticism, which by its primary assumption is not amenable to the discourse of the analytic understanding, such procedure can at best lead to the discovery only of its secondary elements, which it has in common with rationalism, and not of those in which inheres primarily the Romantic character. The essential part of the problem calls for a more direct method and for sources of information offering a more immediate form of authenticity.

There is extant a record of the motives which at the time of the culmination of the first Romantic era determined the development of a Romantic mind during its crucial period. This record is so minute, so sincere, so coherent without a break; it reveals such a sagacity in singling out the actual determining motive in every step and such sincerity and ingenuousness as well as verbal skill that the course and the details of the development of its author appear quite unblurred, even when, as is generally the case, his own theoretic generalizations, inferences, valuations, and anticipations do not tally with them.

There is no similar record of this movement, of such extraordinary completeness and truthfulness, because there has been no character like its author, combining such terrible and single power of growth with such a passionate, unflinching, and immediate vision of the inner forces driving him on, step by step, from the first vague feeling of discomfort caused by the conditions of his inner life to the final ruthless, almost mad, rejection of the last bonds linking him with his environment.

This record is the series of letters[1] written by Heinrich von Kleist to Wilhelmine von Zenge, his fiancée, during the crucial two years of his development, which coincide with the duration of their engagement. The correspondence begins with the year 1800, a few months after Kleist's twenty-fourth birthday, and ends early in 1802. It is singular and explainable only by the prevalent interest in the external and theoretic parts of his work and life that the numerous biographies and other writings upon Kleist have almost completely ignored this most important story of his inner life.

[1] *Kleist's Briefe an seine Braut*, excellently edited by Karl Biedermann. (Breslau and Leipzig, 1884.)

The letters are not a record of introspection, like, for instance, Marie Bashkirchev's self-revelations, in which the motions of a self-conscious attention spread the illusion of activity and development over an essentially barren and static inner life. In Kleist's letters it is the course of the active forces of development which determines the course of his observation. He is little concerned with his processes of perceiving because he is wholly absorbed in the inner action to be perceived. His observations are controlled by the highest dramatic objectivity of consciousness.

The purpose of this paper is to mark off the course of the inner life of Kleist as revealed in these letters. In order that the main line of development be kept as clear and graphic as possible, all matter not essential to the motives of growth and not directly and determinately bearing upon it, however interesting in itself or suggestive in other directions, had to be eliminated. The ban had to fall particularly upon Kleist's own theoretic generalizations as such in their relations to general philosophy.[1] These generalizations are relevant to our subject only in so far as they appear transformed into concrete motives.

This account will, in a concluding section, be supplemented by a brief survey of the forms assumed by the main motives of his conduct in his treatment of the principal characters in his greater creative works.

Heinrich von Kleist was born October 10, 1776. Very little is known of his inner life until the time of his first letter to Wilhelmine. Born in Frankfurt-an-der-Oder, of an old family which had contributed distinguished names to military and literary history, among them Christian Ewald von Kleist, the author of *Frühling*, he entered the Prussian military service. In 1795 he became an ensign in a guard regiment in Potsdam. In 1798 he resigned as second lieutenant, much against the wishes of his chief, who desired to keep the talented, idealistic, and cultured young officer on account of his influence on his less cultured comrades. This resignation is the first instance recorded of the explosive spontaneity and resoluteness which distinguished all the important steps of his career. He had come to the conclusion that the military life would not satisfy the highest

[1] The book by Ernst Kayka, *Kleist und die Romantik* (Vol. 31 of Franz Muncker's *Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte* [Berlin, 1906]), though based on very careful investigation, is inconclusive and external because it is limited to analysis of Kleist's own theories.

demands of his nature, and without a further thought, without any apparent hesitation, he withdrew from it.

His aim, which is stated in a double letter to his former tutor, dated March 18 and 19, 1799, his earliest recorded self-revelation, is the pursuit of happiness and virtue. His terms, quite unoriginal, are the current terms of the popular utilitarian perfectionist philosophy of that time. He matriculated in the old-fashioned university of his native city. He took courses in philosophy, natural science, mathematics, natural law, history of European civilization, political economy, and other subjects. He learned to read Latin and Greek. He also studied, though apparently without systematic guidance and in a desultory manner, Kant's *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, but, as will be seen farther on, he was not mature enough to grasp the radical significance of the *Kritik*.

It was not till the beginning of 1800 that he began to put forth shoots of his own growth, at first timidly, tentatively, and sparsely, but soon with rapidly accumulating force and variety, until, in a climactic burst, he reached the consummation prefigured in his nature. He began at once, in his letters to Wilhelmine, the chronicle of his inner life, the central subject of which is not, as he ingenuously thought, his love for his betrothed, but his fascinated and dramatic interest in the uncontrollable force which was in charge of his inner nature. An epigram uttered by Kleist several years later, "It is not we that think, but something within us that does," covers this objectivity toward his inner mental processes as well as his final subjective fatalism of the *Gefühl*.

In the first letter to Wilhelmine, dated Frankfurt a. O., beginning of 1800, in which he tells her of his love, he discusses his aims at length. He intends to prepare himself for a conventional career suitable for a man of his class. Law and diplomacy are uncongenial, the former because it ignores "the rights of the heart," the latter because it pursues self-interest to the injury of righteousness. Finance has no positive attraction. The academic career seems most desirable because it would offer scientific satisfaction and an opportunity to become a *Weltbürger* ("internationalist").

Thus from the start, even within the limitations of a conventional career, he emphasized in "the rights of the heart" the spontaneous

inclinations of his nature. We are not surprised to find him in the immediate future, in a letter from Frankfurt a. O., May 30, 1800, preoccupied with the *Bildung unserer höhern Seelenkräfte*, "self-cultivation." In this letter, otherwise of little significance, he begins his strenuous attempts, very entertaining in their immaturity and pedantry, to make Wilhelmine share his own development.

Frankfurt soon ceases to satisfy his eager mind. We find him a little later journeying from city to city. There are in the following letters a number of mystifying allusions to important missions. Many attempts have been made to define these as public enterprises, of a financial, political, and even diplomatic character. One writer[1] even concludes that his journey to Würzburg was undertaken in the interest of his health. Adolph Wilbrandt, in his finely written life of Kleist, thinks that even now Kleist was seeking a career as a poet. But all these conclusions rest on no tangible evidence and refer at best only to a part of his journey; and Wilbrandt's theory finds, besides, constant contradiction in the letters almost to the end of the correspondence.

Whatever the objects of these missions may have been, they did not determine the course of his inner development. Kleist himself never interprets them as ends but merely as means to the attainment of a livelihood or self-culture and promptly ignores them whenever he has a new step in his growth to record.

In his letter from Berlin, August 16, 1800, appears his first description of external nature. It is quite conventional. No original interpretation or form of statement, no Romantic "nature sense," appears.

On August 20, 1800, he goes to Pasewalk to see Brockes, a man whom his sister, Ulrike, had met in Rügen. Brockes is highly praised in Varnhagen's *Biographische Denkmäler* as a wise, upright man, friend and counselor of many persons throughout Germany, and passionately adored by men and women. He and Kleist at once become intimate friends and inseparable companions. They travel together and see some officials together. Kleist's admiration for Brockes grows with every letter almost to idolization.

[1] Dr. Max Morris, *Heinr. v. Kleist's Reise nach Würzburg.* (Berlin, 1899.)

Kleist at once speaks in a new tone. He is enthusiastic, almost triumphant. Brockes must have given him some ideas which clarified his own vague aspirations. The nature of the inspiration which must have come from Brockes appears in the following letters, which for a time come in rapid sequence and culminate in a remarkable statement and unqualified acceptance of Brockes' view of life. From Coblentz near Pasewalk on August 21, 1800, the day after their meeting, he writes that he has begun to keep a diary, "in which [he] daily develops and improves his plan." Brockes is going to accompany him on a visit to Struensee, Prussian minister of customs and assizes, for the purpose, probably, of securing a position which would give him a living. Kleist adds: "Our happiness is at the bottom of this trip . . . . nothing can be lost by it and everything gained." There is also in this letter a description of nature, quite matter of fact, with no touch of "nature feeling." There is no indication of any literary intention or bent.

On September 1, in a letter containing another conventional nature description, after the brief statement, "Our business is disposed of," he continues abruptly with an account of his and Brockes' matriculations in the University of Leipzig.

On September 3 he is in Dresden. He is full of zest. It is five o'clock in the morning as he writes Wilhelmine about his life. He speaks of his intention of going to Prague after accomplishing another mysterious business, which also presently drops out of sight, with the British ambassador. He writes considerably, and with increasing emotion, about nature now. His vision is gradually opening, no doubt, under the tutelage of Brockes, who is a disciple of Rousseau. The following passage is typical: "Thus charming was my entry into a charming night. The road always ran along the banks of the Mulde, past rocks which, lighted by the moonlight, looked like shapes of the night. The sky was quite serene, the moon full, the air pure, the whole glorious."

This passage, while not offering original objective material, yet reveals a distinct advance in subjective perception and in concision. Comparison with the original will bring out more clearly the specific concreteness of his impression and phrasing. "So reizend war der Eingang in eine reizende Nacht. Der Weg ging immer am Ufer der

Mulde entlang, bei Felsen vorbei, die wie Nachtgestalten vom Monde erleuchtet waren. Der Himmel war heiter, der Mond voll, die Luft rein, das Ganze herrlich." The untranslatable compactness of the phrase "die wie Nachtgestalten vom Monde erleuchtet waren," the original, also untranslatable felicity of "heiter" as an attribute of a peculiar moonlit night, and the extraordinary terseness and pregnancy of the whole passage offer the first definite glimpse of his emerging originality of perception. In the remainder of the letter a reflection upon the relations between men and their environment—a favorite subject since Montesquieu and Herder—offers a hint of his dominant preoccupation. This passage also would lose much of its specific meaning in translation: "Das *Enge* der Gebirge scheint überhaupt auf das *Gefühl* zu wirken [the italics are mine], und man findet darin viele Gefühlsphilosophen, Menschenfreunde, Freunde der Künste, besonders der Musik. Das *Weite* des *platten* Landes hingegen wirkt mehr auf den Verstand, und hier findet man die Denker und Vielwisser" ("smatterers"). He wishes he had been born in a country which combines the advantages of both mountains and plains.

He is preoccupied with the opposition between *Gefühl* and *Verstand* which had dominated the German youth for a generation, since the influence of Rousseau was first introduced by Hamann and Herder. The odious connotations of *Vielwisser*, which by its grouping and antithesis to the first group are extended even to *Denker*, are characteristic of Brockes' influence, whom in a later letter Kleist quotes as inveighing against the *Gelehrten* as *Vielwisser*.

The Dresden picture gallery which he visits makes no impression on him. He and Brockes, confronting themselves with a choice between art, antiquities, and nature, chose the latter and make an excursion. Kleist is absorbed in sensations at first hand.

On the next day, again at five o'clock in the morning, his absorption in nature leads him one step farther in subjectivity. He becomes conscious of the emotional and motive effect of nature:

> I was wishing intensely [*mit Innigkeit*] to see you present with me [*bei mir zu sehen*]. Such valleys close and secret [*eng und heimlich*], are the true home [*Vaterland*] of love . . . . what a splendid effect would a brief stay in this ideal nature have upon your soul! For the view of creation in its

loftiness and nobility makes deep impressions upon tender and impressive hearts. Nature would surely awaken your emotions and ideas [*das Gefühl und den Gedanken*]; I should endeavor to develop them and create new ideas and emotions.

His purpose of training his own inner faculties and those of others through sense-impressions becomes both more defined and more forceful. The definition proceeds constantly along the lines of the cleavage between *Verstand* and *Gefühl*. In this cleavage the former becomes more and more definitely identified with the conventional order and its offices and obligations. This view and tendency coincide at the beginning on the whole with those of Rousseau, but after running the gamut of Rousseau's ideas pass considerably beyond.

In a letter from Lungwitz (following one from Oederau im Erzgebirge, dated September 4, 1800, 9:00 P.M.), written at 10:30 A.M., this desire to train minds is aroused when he sees girls on the road. "If any of them has only a spark of a soul" he wishes to take her with him, "to train her in accordance with his ideas" (*sie auszubilden in meinem Sinne*). He continues: "Ich selbst muss an mir formen und ausbilden."

In the next letter, written from Zwickau, there occurs the first deliberately aesthetic interpretation of nature. He is departing more and more from his old utilitarian mental associations. Comparing his present scenery with that of his and Wilhelmine's home he adds: "Here one sees nature, as it were, life size. That [the Frankfurt a. O. scenery] is, so to speak, like one of the occasional pieces of great artists, rapidly sketched, not without masterly traits, but imperfect. This, on the other hand, is a piece conceived with enthusiasm, designed with industry and genuis, and placed before the world for certain admiration." From Reichenbach he writes that he is planning that night to write a poem on a pine needle. He is obviously in a state of enthusiasm over impressions of nature even in their most insignificant forms.

MARTIN SCHÜTZE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[*To be concluded*]

THE FAY, PARTICULARLY THE FAIRY MISTRESS, IN MIDDLE HIGH GERMAN

I have elsewhere referred to the fay as a very minor character in Middle High German.[1] This opinion is not advanced because of its novelty; it will hardly be contested by anyone familiar with the literature, and some phases of the matter have been touched on incidentally by students in this field. However, since no exposition of the material on which these conclusions are based, has been made, it may well be in order.

In the February, 1913, issue of the *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Wortforschung*, Professor J. A. Walz, writing on "Fei, Fee . . . . Elfe," says:

> Schon in mhd. Zeit ist das altfranzösische feie oder faie ins Deutsche aufgenommen worden als veie oder veine. Es findet sich bei verschiedenen höfischen Dichtern, doch ist nicht eigentlich volkstümlich geworden. Der Grund für die Aufnahme des Wortes ins Mhd. ist genau derselbe, der im 18. Jahrhundert bei der Einführung von Fee wirksam war: es gab im Deutschen kein Wort, um diese Wesen der französisch-keltischen[2] Überlieferung zu bezeichnen, oder anders ausgedrückt, der deutsche Volksglaube des Mittelalters kannte keine übernatürlichen Wesen, die genau den französischen faies entsprochen hätten. Es gab wohl weibliche Wesen, die in Berg und Wald und Wasser hausten, waltminnen, merwîp, wildiu wîp u.s.w., die mehr oder weniger Ähnlichkeit mit den französischen faies hatten, aber es mangelte diesen Elementargeistern das Feine, das Menschlich-Anziehende, das Durchgebildete der faies. Die enge Verbindung zwischen Rittertum und Feenwelt ist ein Werk der französischen Dichtung. Zugleich mit dieser Dichtung kam auch das Wort veie in die mhd. Literatur.

Naturally, then, we should look for the word *veine* or *fei* in works which are adaptations of, or in some way stand very close to, the French. As a matter of fact, the word is not of common occurrence at all, for the reason we have just mentioned, namely, that it represented something so little known or understood. For the same

[1] "Elementargeister as Literary Characters in the MHG Epic," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, April, 1916.

[2] The *waltminne* and the *merwîp* may be said to bear some resemblance to the Celtic fairy, but the *wildez wîp* can in no sense be compared with that being. Cf. the article referred to in the preceding note.

reason, too, it is not surprising that in most cases it is used of some character that does not appear in the poem, but is referred to, usually in connection with something marvelous. Albrecht von Halberstadt describes a beautiful woman by saying,

einer wilden feyen
geliche sie erlûchte.[1]

In Heinrich vom Türlin's version of the Lanzelet story—a fragment called *Der Mantel*—we hear of the magic power of the test-mantel, wrought by fairy hands:

dem werke noch dem sîden
kunde sich niht glîchen
sô daz in allen rîchen
ie dehein man gesæhe
dem er sô guotes jæhe;
wand in ein fein durch frouwen nît
worhte vor der hôchzît.
diu feine worht den phelle
sô daz er velle:
swelhiu frowe u.s.w. [580].[2]

Ulrich's *Lanzelet* (5764) also has the story of a fairy gift of a cloak which has power to reveal secrets (5995). *Garel* (11929) contains another reference in point. A giant whom Garel has conquered and permitted to live, brings the knight a magic salve of which he claims:

"nieman ist sô sêre wunt
swenne man die salben strîchen dran,
er werde ein wol gesunter man.
ein wîsiu merfeine
meistert si mit wîser hant."

And it will also be remembered that Petitcreu, Gilan's diminutive dog, for the possession of which Tristan does deeds of prowess, is of fairy origin, as the following lines attest:

ein hundelîn . . . .
daz was gefeinet, hôrte ich sagen,
und wart dem herzogen gesant

[1] In a fragment published in *Germania*, X, 240. I am told on good authority that this is the first known appearance of the word in German. Another such simile is found in the *Krone*, 7738:

Bî kleidern sô rîchen
Möhte ich sie wol gelîchen
Einer fei an der schône.

[2] The *fein* is mentioned again in l. 771.

ûz Avalûn, der feinen lant,
von einer gotinne
durch liebe und durch minne [15809].

I have found two instances[1] where the *fei* appears in the story in *propria persona*. Both are from Berthold von Holle. In *Darifant* the knight accedes to the request of Fiolede, a *fei*, to accompany her to Spain where, it appears, an "aventûre von einer maget" awaits him. The other case occurs in *Demantin*. The hero comes into the realm of Pheradzoye, queen of fays, and is there served by "pheien." We shall view these two stories from another angle presently.

Finally, in this enumeration there should be mentioned a slightly different designation of the same character. It was perfectly natural that attempts should be made to render the word *fei* more intelligible by connecting it with some figure already well known. Of the available *Elementargeister*, the giantess and the *wildez wîp* were from their very natures out of the question. The *waltminne* plays no part in Middle High German epics. Hence the *merwîp* and *merminne* form the stem on which the new word and idea are grafted. It was a comparatively easy matter to fuse these characters. The fact that fairyland was sometimes supposed to exist in a region remote in the ocean or even under the water, coincided with the current conception of the *merwîp's* home. Like the *fei*, the *merwîp* was beautiful and charming;[2] also was sometimes to be found in groups apparently segregated from the opposite sex.[3]

In the quotation from *Garel* given above, *merfeine* and not *feine* is the word used. Since it is a mere passing mention, nothing can be said of the nature of the fairy. In Ulrich's *Lanzelet*, however, we have quite a detailed portrayal of this hybrid character. Lanzelet's godmother is a *merfeine*, and rules over 10,000 similar spirits. She comes "mit eime dunst als ein wint" and carries off the child to her distant kingdom in the sea. Loving hands attend him here. He is taught fine manners (241–74), and learns to play and to sing, "wand ez was dâ lantsite" (265). All the fays fall in love with him.

[1] The mention of the presence of "Onorgûe ein rîchiu fei," *Krone*, 1601, is hardly to be counted. Many worthies are catalogued there, of whom nothing is heard elsewhere.

[2] *Eckenliet*, 151; *Daniel vom Blühenden Tal*, 4280.

[3] *Oswald*, 660 f.

After some years, however, the company of women ceases to satisfy him, and the queen has to send for "merwunder," those anomalous denizens of the deep, to instruct Lanzelet in various sports. It is when it finally develops that no one can teach him the ways of knighthood that the young adventurer leaves his fairy home.

This fairyland itself invites a word of discussion. It is an island in the sea, we are told, surrounded by a wall utterly impregnable. A vast castle, golden within and without, situated on a crystal mountain ('sinewel als ein balle') overlooks the land (209 f.). The beauties of this royal dwelling are not shoddy or transitory:

> dehein dinc wart dâ virne
> innerhalp dem burcgraben,
> der ez hundert jâr solte haben
> ez wære ie ebenschoene [226].

So charming, so perfect is the whole, that when one lives there even a day he has no rest elsewhere. It is in short an earthly paradise:

> ir lant was über allez jâr
> als miten meien gebluot . . . . [192]
> dâ enwart ouch nieman hoene
> von zorne noch von nîde.
> die vrouwen wâren blîde
> die dâ beliben wonhaft [230].

From the foregoing it will be seen that we have to do with a foreign type with but slight additions of native material. All due allowance being made for the fact that the author was relying more on his written source than on his fancy, it is still worth while to note that in no other Middle High German epic is the fay so fully treated as in *Lanzelet*. May it not be because the character, here combined somewhat with that of the *merwîp*, admitted of elaboration, whereas the *feine* alone could not be expected to play an important rôle?

What I have given is a practically complete register of Middle High German *feinen*.[1] Compared with the other *Elementargeister* so abundant in that literature, it is a negligible quantity. And yet with such a wealth of Celtic fairy lore throughout Europe, we should

[1] Other instances not specifically mentioned here are to be found in *Parzival*, *Tristan*, Konrad's *Trojanischer Krieg*, and elsewhere. Quoting them would add nothing to the subject.

naturally expect the influence of it on Middle High German to be greater than the foregoing evidence would indicate. And such is really the case. Fays, no longer called such, yet recognizable by various qualities, are found in considerable number in Middle High German. It is a question here of the fairy mistress rationalized.

A. C. L. Brown, in his study of Chrétien's *Iwain*, deals with the rationalized fairy-mistress story there. Since Hartman's *Iwein* is a close translation of the French, the points made in Brown's monograph naturally hold for the Middle High German poem. If the thesis that Laudine is a sometime fairy mistress needs any further proof, the evidence contained in a similar story written about a generation after Hartman should furnish it. I refer to the Pheradzoye episode in *Demantin* cited above. The account given there is as follows:

A severely wounded knight whom Demantin encounters explains that he has met this sad fate at the hands of Pandulet, who guards the entrance to Pheradzoye's castle. Pheradzoye, he says,

> ". . . . is koninginne
> geweldig obir di minne: . . . .
> und obir alle dûtsche lant
> geweldig obir di pheien,
> di an den luften weien,
> und obir alle di nu leben,
> di grôz lôn dorch minne geben" [2991].

The knight guarding the "âbentûre" is on duty for six weeks Demantin is told, or until he has conquered another, who then takes his place. The wounded man warns Demantin not to take the risk, and the latter being intent on a very engaging adventure of his own, rides accordingly in the opposite direction.

He crosses a stream on a ferry, but in the forest which he enters he is unable to avoid a maid whose hunting dog leads her to Demantin. She reproaches the knight very harshly for spoiling her chase, taking occasion also to heap opprobrium on him for running away from the adventure at Castle Gandaris. This is the third time the adventure is brought to his notice (the ferryman also speaks of it). Demantin no longer hesitates, but recrosses the water and rides toward Gandaris.

Before the gate he meets Pandulet and puts an end to him after a brief battle. On the gate itself the survivor finds inscribed the law that he must remain at his post a year. There is no talk of revenge for Pandulet; indeed, he seems to be the only male at the castle, the service being done by *pheien* (3012, 3386, 3501). Hence Demantin does not have to hide, as does Iwain. His presence is taken as a natural consequence and causes no comment. But the similarities to the Laudine story appear in what follows. Pheradzoye, bitterly blaming herself for the loss of Pandulet—for it was she who met Demantin in the forest and turned him back to Gandaris—weeps loud and long. That is, six days long. Further mourning is curtailed by her maid's practical suggestion that she take Demantin in the place of Pandulet as a matter of expediency. Pheradzoye is willing, since her queenship depends on her keeping a guard (3410). Demantin's reply to the proposal is:

> vrouwe, ich mûz und sal hîr sîn,
> sint ich ez nicht irwenden kan,
> habe ich vroude, ich arme man,
> daz mir di sorge aldus heret [3434].

And so he becomes guardian of the castle. But so perfunctory is this service, so lacking in love his relation to Pheradzoye, that she again accepts the advice of the maid Andolŷâ, who suggests that she release Demantin as soon as another comes to take his place. This plan is really carried out, and Demantin, relieved, rides away.

With the exception of *Darifant*,[1] by the same author, this is the only fairy-mistress story in Middle High German in which fays as such really appear, and is at the same time the least rationalized of all. To be sure, it is in general the conventional mediaeval romance. But it will easily be seen that this version, while having something in common with the *Iwein* story, is older and, as it were, more genuine. Two traditions are fused here: that of the human lover of the fairy, and that of the guard or protector. In the present story the fay herself acts as messenger. The fact that she is on a hunt is doubtless a reflection of the older motif that the hero is decoyed by an animal

[1] Apparently a fairy-mistress story also. The fay messenger appears in the fragment that has come down to us, the "perilous passage" is begun, and Darifant fights at least one battle, after which he, though victor, must spend a given time in the land. We are informed that Effâdie, the object of his quest, is to be liberated from imminent danger.

while hunting. No such animal enters the story in this case, unless the dog which seeks out Demantin may be said to replace the stag, boar, or other beast which usually leads the human to the fairy. The difficulty in reaching the home of the fairy, while not a prominent feature, is still present, represented by the passage of the water (Demantin almost drowns in recrossing) and the battle with Pandulet. Then comes the sojourn in fairyland, marred, as so often, by a longing for something in the world of men, which finally causes the human to terminate his stay in the other world. In all this the fairy shows a passion for the man; it is she who is aggressive in the love affair. And yet she is not altogether free to dispose of her favors at will. Queen though she is, she is yet subject to certain restrictions.

These limitations arise principally from the other tradition in the story. It has been pointed out more than once that the guardian knight in such stories originally had nothing to do with the human lover, but was merely a servant of the fairy, later her keeper. In such versions as the present one, a condition rests on both fairy and guard, one of those laws which bind even such divine beings as the fay. Hence the nature of the "âbentûre." Its effect on our story is not hard to trace. In the first place, Demantin, who has no mind to turn aside from his real quest, is constrained to undertake the adventure. He finds his fate inscribed on the gate of the castle and does not try to escape it. His relation to Pheradzoye is not really a union. No nuptials are celebrated, no "Beilager" is mentioned. These conditions do not comport with the character of the human lover of a fairy mistress, and we cannot imagine any fay enduring such indifference under ordinary circumstances. Yet we see that Pheradzoye cannot dismiss Demantin until the condition has been satisfied, i.e., till the next adventurer takes his place.

Demantin, then, does not present all the features of the fairy-mistress story. A more rationalized type, yet one in which the old tradition shows through in more perfect form, is *Seifrid de Ardemant*. The old Germanic saga of Siegfried is here interwoven with an Arthurian romance. To this confusion are added various mythological motifs, making the poem excellent material for the folklorist. The reader who is interested in these details is referred to the introduction of Panzer's edition, where that very able editor has given

sixty pages to the analysis of the material. We can look only at that portion which pertains immediately to our subject.

Mundirosa, like Pheradzoye, goes in search of her lover. The author later feels called on to explain this, so we are informed that the lady was acting on a prophecy which proclaimed that she was to find her mate in a distant land. Nor is Seifrid's meeting with her altogether a matter of accident. The thing begins with the adventure of the flaming heath, well known in the Siegfried story. Being told in a certain city that he had better turn back since he could not cross the heath, he determines to dare it. Despite the flames and a terrible storm,[1] Seifrid comes through unscathed. Instead of the sleeping beauty beyond, however, he encounters a serpent, which he has difficulty in overtaking. The serpent is a messenger animal—the enchanted-lady type well known in *Volksmärchen*.[2] The lady released from this form is naturally the heroine. But the author's adoption of the *Märchen* does not go so far in this case, for when restored to human form this girl dies, and our hero is left to wander on till he comes upon the real heroine.

Properly speaking, the perilous journey is made only to fairyland. But the beginning of the episode in *Seifrid* is, as just seen, a story in itself with its own "perilous journey." And the idea of obstructive dangers is extended to Seifrid's further passage of the heath; although it is not attended by fire and storm, it is made uncomfortable by his getting lost and hungry; and in the end a mountain must be crossed which is surrounded by a thorn hedge and beset with "slange, lintwurm, trecken," and "leoen."

Topping this mountain, Seifrid beholds on a meadow a brilliant company of ladies (and knights[3]) coming forward to greet him as an awaited guest. Mundirosa, leader of the procession, arrayed in her royal bravery, calls Seifrid by name, embraces him, and makes him generally welcome. She knows all about his previous career and has waited for him three successive years on this meadow. But Seifrid may stay with Mundirosa only three days for the first. Wonderful days! but soon past; and Seifrid must take his leave for

[1] Cf. Iwein's experience at the "Fountain Periluos."

[2] Cf. Laistner, *Rätsel des Sphinx*, I, 78 f.; also Panzer, p. lxxvi.

[3] Evidently only supplied to comply with the author's sense of social fitness.

a year, bowing also to Mundirosa's behest that in that time he boast not the beauty of his mistress.

Here then we have one of the most characteristic scenes of the fairy-mistress story. The hero's stay with his lady is limited, sometimes by his own longing to get back among his fellows, sometimes —as here—by the command of the fairy, who in turn seems to be complying with a condition beyond her control. For the hero this restraint generally takes the form of a prohibition such as the foregoing.

Of course the hero breaks the command. For this incident again *Seifrid* is quite typical.[1] Restlessly the knight goes about the world trying his fortune here and there, and one day presents himself at a tourney where he is eventually crowned as victor. The prize is the embrace of a young lady whose beauty is not likely to be contested, since not to recognize her as the fairest of all entails the death of the doubter unless he can produce one fairer still. Seifrid regards the beauty with indifference, and is careless enough to remark to a fellow-knight how she would suffer in contrast to his mistress. The boast is caught up and swift judgment is about to be executed on his hapless head when Mundirosa attended by a resplendent train appears to prove his words true. Seifrid is released. But Mundirosa, after listening to his prayer for forgiveness, tells him sadly that they may not see one another again.

Then follows the usual period of wandering about, ending at last in the decision to return to the place of first meeting.[2] But the mountain meadow is empty now; only, near by he finds a hermit who gives him advice as to how to reach the country of his mistress. A griffin, he says, is in the habit of coming across the water from Mundirosa's land to fetch food for its young, and Seifrid is to make use of this aerial carrier. Here then we come to the real "perilous passage" of our story. But the matter is really quite simple. The hermit sews the knight into the hide of his slaughtered horse and the griffin obligingly bears him across the vast expanse of water.[3]

[1] Also *Gauriel von Muntabel*, a most unoriginal epic containing a fairy-mistress story, and incorporating a heterogeneous mass of borrowed motifs.

[2] One is reminded in this of Wolfdietrich's experience with the *rûhe* Elsa.

[3] The perilous passage is almost always across some body of water, perhaps a brook, sometimes a sea. It will be remembered that Lancelet was carried to fairyland in the arms of his godmother flying over the sea. A similarity between *Demantin* and *Seifrid*

The passage lasts some days. After cutting himself out of the hide and climbing down from the griffin's nest, Seifrid finds himself in a wild country, still some distance from the castle of his mistress. The last stage of the journey is done on a raft, under the guidance of a "wilder man."[1]

The story ends in the usual way. Seifrid enters the land incognito, vanquishes the aspirant, to the hand of the mistress, and, on making himself known, is joyfully received. Of course his arrival and rescue are very timely: a little more and the lady would have been beyond his grasp.

The essential features of the story in *Seifrid* can be found again in Konrad von Würzburg's *Partonopier und Meliur*, a fairly close translation from the French *Partonopeus de Blois*.[2] The tale has, at least at the beginning, the charm which the mediaeval author often knew how to give his narrative by depicting the hero as little more than a child. Young Partonopier, on the occasion of a hunt with his uncle in the forest of Arden, gives chase to a boar which leads him away from the rest of the company. Roving about for a day and a night in great distress, he reaches the seashore and there finds a ship, wonderfully made, "sam ez ein wilde feine / ze wunsche ir selbe hæte erwelt" (640).[3] The gangplank is invitingly placed, Partonopier goes aboard, taking his horse with him. Wearied from his exertions he falls asleep, only to find on awaking that the ship is moving of its own accord and that there is no land in sight. He is startled and weeps,

> sam die knaben und diu kint,
> diu fruo zen nœten komen sint,
> der si wâren ungewone [683].

just here is interesting. In both the hero in his anxiety to get there is ready to swim. Each is saved by a bystander from this certain death, Demantin by the ferryman, Seifrid by the hermit.

[1] Essentially the same type of character as the knight who guards the fairy's castle in *Demantin*.

[2] I have compared the translation with the French and find that in the matter of the fairy-mistress story they agree in all important particulars. Konrad is even meticulous in keeping the names applied to the fairy, whereas in the poem at large he allows himself—whether from choice or ignorance—considerable liberty.

[3] French: "Tant bele con se fust faée."

But the bark is more than royally equipped, so that the boy finds his passage rather tolerable after all.

The boat stops at last before a beautiful castle, and our young adventurer knows nothing but to land. Wonders continue to greet him on every hand. He is fascinated by the magnificance of the castle from a distance; on entering it, however, he is astounded to find never a "muoter barn" within its walls. Partonopier suspects that it is the devil's work, but decides that if he is the victim, he will enjoy the situation as long as it lasts. Accordingly he passes by the many elegant and inviting halls on every side and makes for the heart of the citadel. Here he meets with the adventure of his life. First, being hungry, he turns into the dining-hall, where invisible hands serve him a royal repast. This over, he seats himself by the fire and is presented with various drinks. Finally, when he is sleepy, two candles light him to his bedchamber, where still other unseen servitors bring him to bed.

Partonopier has all the optimism of unsophisticated youth. Nothing that could happen to him now would surprise him; but though he half expects death to be his lot, he thanks God that he has at least dined well once more. While in this cheerful mood, he discovers that someone is getting into his bed. This person, the fairy mistress, pretends great indignation at finding her bed occupied, but Partonopier will not budge, maintaining that there is nowhere else for him to go and that he is innocent. In the end the whole adventure is cleared up, and Partonopier learns that Meliur used the boar to decoy him and the self-sailing ship to bring him to her. She places herself and her kingdom at his disposal; for he is the mate she has chosen from among all men. The public acknowledgment, however, cannot be made till a date set by her two and a half years hence, by which time Partonopier will have become a knight. Until then he must not behold her.

The young man spends a year in this strange country, where his every wish is met by his still unseen and silent retinue. Only with Meliur can he speak, and she remains invisible. When he expresses a desire to revisit France, she consents and, explaining that she knows that he is needed there, even promises him the means ('einen rîchen hort') for the battles he must fight; but she warns him again not

to break the condition which she put upon him at the outset. He recrosses the sea on the magic ship, and on his arrival his mistress makes good her promise to him.

With all his battles won, Partonopier begins to pine for his loved one again. His mother draws from him the source of his melancholy and immediately sets to work to cure him of it. She lays the matter before the king and persuades him to give his niece in marriage to her son. By means of a love philter she all but succeeds in consummating the match. At the critical moment, however, the bride unwisely congratulates Partonopier on his deliverance from the wiles of "der veinen wilde," whereupon he comes to himself, leaves home, and finding the boat waiting for him, sails away once more to Meliur.

On his next visit home the mother of Partonopier seeks to accomplish her object in another way: she has the Archbishop of Paris come and reason with the young man. Partonopier is unable to prove that he is not consorting with the devil; indeed, under the combined arguments of the bishop and his mother, he begins to believe himself that he has been deceived by "ein geist, ald ungehiurez eteswaz." So he agrees at last to test the thing out. With a special sort of lantern, furnished by his mother, he returns to his mistress, and in the dead of night throws a light on his bedmate. What he sees is not a devil, as predicted; rather an angel—a woman of whose beauty the author says:

got selber vil harte fleiz,
dô si geschuof sîn meisterschaft [7872].

Of course a scene of stormy grief on both sides ensues.[1] But now comes the interesting solution of the supernatural element. Meliur tells her story, from which it appears that she is not a fay at all; she is simply a princess of Constantinople who has studied astrology, necromancy, etc., at the request of her father. This accounts for all her power. And that power is now at an end because of Partonopier's indiscretion. He will now be seen by her people (hitherto nothing has been said of *his* invisibility, but the people's) and she will be compromised. This is all forced, of course. So too the hubbub next morning when Partonopier is found with Meliur is a

[1] Of the lady the following lines are expressive:
mit herzewazzer si dâ twuoc
ir liehten wängel rosenvâr [7960].

tempest in a teapot, is rank nonsense. The scene might have been avoided by packing Partonopier off in the night instead of waiting for the telltale daylight.

The tale is long drawn out, but for us the conclusion may be briefly told. Partonopier ships back home in the vessel we already know. He refuses to be comforted, he lets his hair and nails grow, and neglects himself generally until he is on the verge of death. Meliur's sister finds him thus in the forest. She takes him to her home (an island kingdom, the gift of Meliur) and finally brings about a reconciliation. But in the end Partonopier has to overthrow a powerful suitor before he can claim his bride.

It can be easily seen from this sketch that the author—first the French and following him the German—has avoided the fairy motif at all costs, although it was inherent to an unalterable degree in the tradition. He simply refuses to take the responsibility for that phase of the story. The forest of Arden is described as "hisdouse et faée"—a remark which Konrad did not see fit to take over—and the boat is "as if" it were that of a fairy. The expression *veine* is used on two other occasions: once by Partonopier's would-be bride as quoted above; and again when the mother says to the archbishop, "ein wildiu veine in triuget" (7500). Neither of these is a direct statement by the author, who throughout treats the existence of fairies as a superstition. In fact, in both the cases just cited, *veine* is used as equivalent of sorceress or devil. The mother says in the next breath:

> "seht, herre, daz erschrecket mich,
> wan ich gelouben muoz dâ bî,
> daz diu selbe frouwe sî
> niht anders wan der vâlant" [7516].[1]

As the story proceeds the fairy element is put out of sight more and more. Whatever might have been due to it originally is explained on other grounds.

The motif of the silent castle with its service by invisible hands is employed again by one of the least original of the Middle High German poets, der Pleier, in his *Tandareis und Flordibel*. Here it is

[1] Cf. also 7468, 6882, 6903, 6828, 6840 for the same or similar appellations.

stripped of all its supernatural qualities by a rather prosaic explanation. After the completion of many knightly labors Tandareis, finding time hanging heavy on his hands, "nâch âventiur wolt rîten in dem walt," albeit "daz gebirge was so vram/ und der walt so irresam." He comes into the wildest region imaginable, and all but perishes in the attempt to cross a mountain there. Going down the opposite slope he discovers by the side of a waterfall a house grander than any King Arthur ever built. No one comes forward to welcome the traveler, who nevertheless enters and makes himself at home, enjoying among other things a sumptuous repast. Eventually the queen of the castle with her retinue of women returns. It seems that they have merely been out taking the air. The knight who spends some days here is still puzzled about the way things are done. Naturally Queen Albiun and her company[1] toil not, neither do they spin, yet there is not a servant to be seen. Albiun satisfies his curiosity at last by telling him that a corps of dwarfs from the mountain slip in every morning and do the work while the company is out (9676 f.). The inadequacy of this explanation scarcely needs pointing out. It is characteristic of der Pleier's clumsiness.

An echo of the situation in *Partonopier und Meliur* is to be found again in *Friedrich von Schwaben*. The hero pursues a stag in the forest, leaving his men far behind. Night finds him in the midst of the forest, where he has lost his game and his bearings. But at this juncture he discovers a house which, though seemingly without inhabitant, still offers shelter and food. In the night something keeps plucking at him as he lies in bed. On seizing the offender he finds that it is a girl, who now tells him a story of a wicked stepmother and the spell by which she condemned the girl to take the form of a stag by day. One of the things that Friedrich has to do to release Angelburg is to share her bed for a long period without approaching her and without beholding her. He does let himself

[1] "niwan zwelf man" are mentioned as a part of the company. The preponderance of women here just as truly as in the kingdom of Lanzelet's godmother, or at the court of Mundirosa, Meliur, and others, attests the foreign influence of the kingdom of fays. I believe that this influence is also felt where direct evidence is wanting. Thus we find Virginal living in her isolated mountain-castle, ruling, to be sure, not over fays, but over those—to the German mind—more familiar *Elementargeister*, dwarfs. Jerome in *Friedrich von Schwaben* is herself a dwarf, queen of a dwarf kingdom. She becomes the mistress of the hero, who later flees from her subterraneous kingdom back into the world of men. After many years have elapsed a reconciliation takes place between the two.

be persuaded to look on her and so fails at that time to break the spell. I hardly need call attention to the fact that this episode is connected with various popular traditions,[1] but certain features of the fairy-mistress story are still recognizable.

One of the most delightful of the Middle High German epics dealing with this theme is *Peter von Staufenberg*. Although supposed to be based on *Partonopier*,[2] it differs from that poem in many respects, and in general offers a pleasing variety in the midst of a literature altogether too stereotyped. The story is very similar to that told by Marie de France in her *Lanval*.[3] Sir Peter fares forth from his castle one day and sees a *frouwe* sitting on a stone by the roadside. She returns his greeting so warmly that he dismounts and talks with her. On the knight's part it is love at first sight. As for the lady she tells him that she has been watching over him from his childhood up; she has kept him from harm in all his battles, and has thus made his name famous throughout the world. Upon his petition that she be with him his life long, she explains that he has but to wish for her when he is alone and she will appear. The happiness in store for Peter is marred somewhat by a condition as usual. And yet the terms of the lady's proposition seem at first blush liberal enough:

swenn du denn wilt, so hastu mich,
swa du alterseine bist.
nu sag ich dir bi diser frist:
und wiltu trüten minen lip,
so muostu ane elich wip
iemer sin unz an din tot
und lebest gar an alle not
biz an den jungestlichen tag,
daz dich nüt gekrenken mag

[1] Cf. p. 303.

[2] See Jäckel, *Egenolf von Staufenberg, ein Nachfolger Konrads von Würzburg*. Marburg, 1898.

[3] I was struck by this similarity before I learned that C. W. Pettyman had pointed it out (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, No. 21, p. 204). I have not read the article, but I am surprised that Schröder in the introduction to his edition of *Peter* does not lend more credence to the suggestion that Egenolf used some other source than Konrad for the plot of the story, however much he may be indebted to the latter in points stylistic. *Peter von Staufenberg* represents another type of fairy-mistress story from that found in *Partonopier*, and I feel sure without other evidence that the tradition comes from elsewhere. It is easy to see that Egenolf is writing under French influence. Cf. l. 799, where a court dwarf, a being peculiar to French tradition, appears.

und daz du niemer swecher wirst,
ist daz du elich wip verbirst.
nim swelch du wil, wan nüt zer e.
darzu hastu iemer me
guotes swes din herz begert,
des bistu, frünt von mir gewert.
aber nimst ein elich wip,
so stirbet din vil stolzer lip
darnach am dritten tage:
fürwar ich daz sage,
wan ez nieman erwenden kan [380].

It will be noted that the law of conduct laid down here is inexorable. The lady has no power to change its course. She regrets later that she has become his mistress and would unquestionably free him from danger if she could. The condition of secrecy which in *Partonopier* or in *Gauriel* is retained but appears silly and unmotivated, is here removed: Peter, when pressed for his reasons for not marrying, is expressly told to publish the facts "stille und überlut." He has every inducement to avoid the penalty. And yet he fails.

There is no other-world journey in *Peter von Staufenberg* for the fairy here, like Lanval's mistress, is a child of nature, at home everywhere, but queen of no particular land. Instead of the perilous journey to fairyland Peter's traveling takes the form of a grand tour on which he displays the splendor showered on him by his mistress. Upon his return his brothers urge him to take a wife, to which he replies:

"ich wil ein friez leben han
die wile ich heize ein junger man" [665].

When older members of the family are brought in to convince him of the error of his way, he swears he will let himself be cut to pieces before he will marry.

At this juncture, as in *Partonopier*, a king brings his influence to bear by insisting that Peter wed his "muome." Cornered at last, Peter confesses the existence of his mistress, only to be told by a bishop present that such a bedfellow can be none other than the devil. The upshot of it is that the young man is prevailed on to consent to the marriage. Here the similarity with *Partonopier* ends. The farewell visit which his mistress pays Peter is lacking in all that

makes Meliur's dismissal of her lover sensational and absurd. Peter is simply told again that if he persists in taking a wife he must die. As a warning his mistress will let her foot be seen during the wedding festivities and that will mean that Peter has but three days of grace. The knight does carry out his purpose in the matter of the wedding, the beautiful but ominous foot appears over the heads of the wedding party, and on the third day thereafter "von Stoufenberg her Peterman" succumbs to the death which no power could avert.

It would be a pity to leave this little epic without paying tribute to its literary merits. It has the advantage of brevity with the attendant virtue of unity. In both these qualities it resembles *Lanval* more than it does *Partonopier*. In its ending, however, it is like neither, but reminds one rather of the Faust legend. The narration is concise and dramatic, at no point lacking in interest. My own testimony to this fact might be couched in the statement that this is the only Middle High German epic which I can boast to have read several times. It belongs to the class which Golther does not hesitate to call *Novellen*.

Indeed, the very technique of *Peter von Staufenberg* warns us that we have passed through the Middle High German period and are bordering on a more modern era, whose taste runs to *Schwänke* and *Volksbücher* rather than to sententious, meandering, and long-winded epics. The passing of knighthood with its infinite leisure and unbounded love of romance, the rising bourgeois influence in politics, religion, and literature, and the coming of humanism with its potent ally, the printing-press, bring an entirely new order of things and close the first chapter in the history of fairy lore in German literature.

H. W. PUCKETT

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

INTERCALATIONS IN THE NOVELS OF ALFRED MEISSNER[1]

A considerable amount of interspersed material is to be found in the novels of the Austrian writer, Alfred Meissner, fiction which in the preceding generation enjoyed a wide popularity in German-speaking countries. Meissner's intercalations do not always take the same form, in fact, it is possible to classify them in a general way. Often they occur as mere anecdotes; at times they are present as a sort of sketch of a character's previous life, a fairly brief *Lebensabriss;* again they assume the diary or letter form; sometimes they constitute a distinct story within a story, in the manner of the *Ich-Erzählung.*[2] Save for rare and brief quotations Meissner makes no use of interpolated lyric material such as was so common in the novels of the Romanticists, following Goethe's example in *Wilhelm Meister,* and was still found in abundance in Gutzkow's ponderous novel, *Ritter vom Geiste,* which, as Klemperer[3] has shown, influenced in many respects the *Zeitroman* of Meissner's times. Nor are frame stories in the manner of Boccaccio, such as Goethe, Tieck, and Hauff have popularized in German literature, present in Meissner's works. For the purpose of analysis it will be best to regard separately each of the styles of intercalation which are met with in our author.

As a rule Meissner's anecdotes are introduced for the light they cast on some character, either the narrator, or the person or persons about whom they are told. Considered from this point of view their presence is justified in the plot. They are narrated quite briskly and vividly, and do not interfere seriously with the progress of the story.

[1] The following investigation is the revision and extension of a part of a doctoral dissertation entitled *A Study in the Technique of the Novels of Alfred Meissner,* presented at Harvard University, in 1915.

[2] Intercalations, particularly of the latter two varieties, are of course rather common in the novelistic literature of all countries. Wilhelm Kaiser in his *Untersuchungen über Immermann's Romantechnik,* Halle, 1906, pp. 47 ff. points out how their too abundant use leads to "Formlosigkeit," as in the novels of Sterne and Jean Paul, although a novel without some interruptions would appear "marmorglatt und marmorkalt."

[3] Victor Klemperer, *Die Zeitromane Friedrich Spielhagens und ihre Wurzeln,* pp. 44–59. (*Forschungen zur neureren Literaturgeschichte,* Band XLIII), Weimar, 1913.

Such an anecdote is the following, related by Princess Parergi in *Zwischen Fürst und Volk:*[1]

"Lord Panmure, den Du allerdings in Florenz bei mir gesehen haben musst," erwiderte die Fürstin, "ist ein ernsthafter und würdiger Englishman, der sich vorgenommen hatte, mir hier am Genfer See einen Besuch abzustatten, und in der That hier eintraf. Nun, Ihr habt doch die komischen Cabriolets bemerkt, die nur hier zu Lande üblich zu sein scheinen und nicht wie andere Gefährte nach vorn, sondern quer ihrer Länge nach, in der Richtung des Rades zu offen sind? Lord Panmure steigt mit Murray's Handbuch zu Genf in eine dieser Kaleschen, fährt, den Wegweiser treulich studirend, von Genf nach Lausanne, von Lausanne nach Villeneuve, von dort auf dem savoyischen Gebiete über Evian-Thonon zurück. Er steigt in jeder grösseren Stadt auf dem Marktplatz ab und übernachtet zweimal. Nach Engländerart lässt er sich mit Niemandem, der ihm nicht vorgestellt ist, in ein Gespräch ein. Nach Genf heimgekehrt, sagt er endlich zu mir: diese Gegend gefällt mir ganz gut, aber ich weiss nur nicht, wie die Leute behaupten können, es gebe hier in der Nähe einen See. Ich habe eine Rundreise durch alle Orte gemacht, die man als am See gelegene bezeichnet, und keinen See auffinden können. Der Wagen, in dem der Arme sass, hatte die offene Hälfte der Landseite zugekehrt."

In *Schwarzgelb* a charming little anecdote is told about Frau von Sesie and her escapades with three students. It reflects little on the character of the narrator, Ostrow, who is of minor importance in the action, but gives a vivid idea of its heroine. Meissner introduces it, in fact, expressly to this end:[2]

. . . . Ihre tollen Streiche — deren macht sie freilich genug — sind so harmloser Art — so kindisch, neckisch — doch, soll ich Ihnen, Prinz, einen dieser närrischen Streiche erzählen, damit Sie von einem auf alle schliessen und einen klareren Begriff von ihrem Charakter erhalten, als ich ihn Ihnen durch die geringe Kunst der Charakteristik, über die ich gebiete, geben kann?

But occasionally an anecdote may be related for another purpose than to explain character. An interesting case of this kind is to be

[1] See pp. 177, 178. The edition used is *Gesammelte Schriften*, Leipzig, 1872. Other novels of Meissner referred to and not contained in this edition are *Die Kinder Roms*, Berlin, 1870; *Feindliche Pole*, Berlin, 1878; *Auf und Nieder*, Berlin, 1880.

[2] *Schwarzgelb*, II, 55, 56. It may be compared in this respect with the lively anecdote related by Leidenfrost in *Ritter vom Geiste* about the Theaterintendant, Herr von Harder. See 6. Aufl., 4. Band, 8. Buch, pp. 120–23, Berlin, 1878. Harder, it may be observed, bears a considerable resemblance to Baron Gospot-Kircher, Intendant des königlichen Hoftheaters, in Meissner's *Feindliche Pole*, and served perhaps as a model for this character.

found in *Babel*, where one is employed to motivate the naming of the novel. The father of Count Mersenburg, a minor character of the story, decided to erect a tower, "Eine Art Walhalla, — wenn ich es mit diesem germanischen Namen bezeichen darf — eine Ruhmeshalle, in welcher er alle Nationalitäten unseres Kaiserstaates repräsentirt sehen wollte —." This tower, however, owing to difficulties inherent in the plan, did not reach completion: "Endlich liess er Alles liegen, und da ragt nun der seltsame Thurm als halbe Ruine auf dem Hügel dort und wird von den Leuten in der Umgegend der Thurm von Babel genannt."[1]

Short biographies of the personages of the story are frequently met with in our author, whose practice in the actual writing of his novels reminds one of the preparation for composition of the Russian Turgenieff who first "wrote out a sort of biography of each of the characters, and everything that they had done and that had happened to them up to the opening of the story."[2] Such sketches are sparsely represented in Meissner's first novelistic productions, *Sansara* and *Zwischen Fürst und Volk*, and are more common in the later, particularly his *Zeitromane*, of which *Schwarzgelb* is a good exemplar. Although they serve to illuminate the individuality of the persons about whom they are related, it cannot be denied that they retard the action of the plot considerably. They are the mark of a diffuse rather than of a concentrated narrative style such as that of the Swiss C. F. Meyer, and they instil epic breadth instead of directness and dramatic progression into Meissner's work. His technique, in this respect, shows perhaps the influence of Sir Walter Scott,[3] whose novels were so widely read in Germany toward the middle of the last century. Let us consider, in some detail, such a *Lebensabriss*.

Frau von Sesie has an interesting record.[4] Her father, a night watchman in a suburban theater in Vienna, secures a position for her as a young

[1] *Babel*, II, 99–101. For other examples cf. *ibid.*, II, 87, 86; *Neuer Adel*, I, 143, 144; *Sansara*, I, 235–39; *ibid.*, II, 82–85; *Schwarzgelb*, I, 59, 60; *ibid.*, 166, 167.

[2] See Henry James's introduction to *Memoirs of a Sportsman*, pp. xxx, xxxi, London, 1905.

[3] "Scott hat die Methode: wenn er eine neue Figur entweder hat auftreten oder erwähnen lassen, so schlägt er sich allemal ins Mittle, uns eine historische und biographische Skizze von derselben zu geben, ja wohl von ihrem ganzen Stamme, ..." Cf. Otto Ludwig, *Gesammelte Schriften*, 6. Band, p. 86, Leipzig, 1891.

[4] *Schwarzgelb*, II, 87–89.

girl, in a ballet. Suitors are soon attracted by her exceptional beauty. The first to find favor in her eyes are the supernumeraries of the theater, and they are succeeded by a waiter. Presently she graduates from the humble garçon to a head waiter, who in turn yields to a journalist. The latter is supplanted in her affections by the attaché of an embassy. Subsequently her history is veiled in gloom until she emerges in the demi-monde of Paris, bearing the name and title of an imaginary and defunct nobleman. Henceforth she chooses to move in semi-aristocratic circles. She receives many brilliant offers of marriage, but refuses them all in order to maintain the secrets of her youth.

The police-spy, Burda, receives in part the following biographical sketch, the introduction of which is specially motivated:

Doch es ist Zeit, dass wir dem Leser eine Biographie des Mannes bringen, dessen Charakter ihm bereits aus der Darstellung des Chevalier bekannt geworden. Sie ist in Kürze folgende:

Als Sohn armer Eltern war Burda sehr früh bei einem Krämer in einer böhmischen Landstadt in die Lehre getreten. Er that nicht gut, wechselte mehrmals die Stellung und kam, nach mannigfachen Glückswechseln, endlich als Commis in ein Prager Handelshaus. Auch dort konnte er sich nicht halten und war im tiefsten Grunde seiner Seele mit seiner Stellung unzufrieden. Hier war es, wo er seinen ersten Geniestreich ausführte und seinen, in eine nicht unbedeutende Zolldefraudation verwickelten Brodherrn denuncirte. Er hatte sich als Preis bedungen, dass man ihm die Stelle eines Finanzaufsehers gebe, und diese ward ihm in der That zum Lohne. Da hatte nun sein Talent das rechte Feld gefunden. Er nahm, wo es ging, an allen Bestechungen Theil und verrieth die betrogenen Betrüger. Da er sich dabei stets die loyalste Miene zu erhalten wusste, war er endlich, für so viel Verdienste um den österreichischen Staats-Schatz, zum Revisionsbeamten befördert worden und hatte als solcher die Aufgabe, die Untergebenen, die früher seinesgleichen gewesen, auf der Bahn der Rechtlickheit zu überwachen.[1]

On rare occasions the intercalation consists of a document, such as letters or leaves from an old diary. Three insertions of this nature occur in Meissner's novels. In each case they have a direct connection with the story, either adding a shade of mystery, or offering a solution for something not fully understood in the past. They are also valuable for the aid they render in interpreting the characters of their writers, although they do not afford Meissner, as

[1] See *Schwarzgelb*, II, 47–49. For other examples of this frequent practice cf. *Neuer Adel, Vorspiel*, pp. 16, 17; *ibid.*, I, 85; *Feindliche Pole*, I, 26–30; *ibid.*, I, 151–53; *Kinder Roms*, I, 89, 90; *ibid.*, II, 29, 30; *Babel*, I, 94, 95; *ibid.*, I, 114, 115; *Zwischen Fürst und Volk*, I, 15, 16; *Sansara*, III, 105, 106.

they did Goethe in the entries in Ottilie's diary in the *Wahlverwandtschaften*, a means of uttering deep truths and wise reflections on life.[1] Thus Reinhold, the hero of *Zwischen Fürst und Volk*, finds some sheets of a diary, yellow with age. They introduce an element of mystery into the story, for Reinhold is not content till the history of the author is cleared up. This intercalation, like the other two mentioned above, is couched in emotional prose, which is often elegiac and at times just falls short of being rhythmical. We quote a specimen of this prose:[2]

Ich kam eben nach Hause. Es ist beinahe Mitternacht. Es war ein vergeblicher Gang; noch kein Brief, keine Nachricht von Dir! Ich kam nach Hause mit der ganzen Last einer im vollen Gewühle der Menschen einsamen Seele, mit der Unruhe einer zerstörenden Unzufriedenheit. Es ist, als wenn Stimmen von Geistern, die mein Loos ergriffen hat, riefen: Agnes, arme Agnes! Aber mein stolzes Herz will von Dir Trost empfangen. O, dass Du nicht so fern wärest, dass Du mir zur Seite ständest — ich bin so tief unglücklich und möchte mein Haupt an deine Schulter lehnen! Einen ähnlichen Zustand ertrage ich am Tage und verberge ihn hinter einem schweigsamen Wesen. In der unbelauschten Stube und in übernächtigen Augenblicken ertrag' ich ihn nicht, — da muss ich die Hände ringen — geisterartig! . . . .

A similar intercalation is to be found in *Babel* in the letters of Julie von Weyher. They give the clue by which the mystery of the birth of Veronica, the heroine of the novel, is finally explained. Meissner accompanies these letters with the following interesting description of their nature:

Es waren die Ergüsse eines leidenschaftlichen Herzens, die vor im wieder aufwallten; eine Lyrik war in diesen Briefen, die er kaum mehr verstand. Die Geliebte sagte ihrem Freunde in hundert Weisen, was er ihr sei, und brachte den Hymnus ihres Fühlens nie zu Ende. Schmerz über ihre Verlassenheit, Gram und Zorn über die Welt, in welcher sie den, der ihr alles war, nicht als den Ihrigen bekennen durfte, Sorge, die das verspätete Eintreffen jedes Briefes wie eine beginnende Vernachlässigung empfand, dann wieder Glück, Jubel über jedes ihr zukommende Lebenszeichen und Liebeswort mischten sich darin.[3]

[1] Cf. Dr. Robert Riemann, *Goethes Romantechnik*, pp. 131–33, Leipzig, 1902.

[2] *Zwischen Fürst und Volk*, I, 100, 101.

[3] *Babel*, I, 163. Cf. also *Neuer Adel*, III, 222–26, in which the long, hidden letters of Marie von Rosenstern are introduced to throw light on her character and reveal her past history.

But by far the most important intercalations made by our author are the *Ich-Erzählungen* which he scatters with generous hand throughout his novels. Each story of this sort is of course related by one of the characters of the novel in which it occurs, and usually has a direct connection with the plot, explaining something which hitherto has not been clear to the peruser. In other words we have for the most part to do with a type of interpolations which have been termed "nachträgliche Ich-Erzählungen,"[1] and which, while not essentially different from the usual interpolated story, avoid to a certain extent the disturbing elements in it. Since they illuminate something the reader is anxious to understand, they are somewhat more welcome than those which merely interrupt the action to tangle, not unravel the plot. In no one novel, however, does Meissner begin to use as many "nachträgliche Ich-Erzählungen" as does Karl Gutzkow in his *Ritter vom Geiste*, in which the obscurity, which envelops practically every one of the more important characters, must thus be lightened.[2]

A good case of our author's practice in this regard may be observed in *Zwischen Fürst und Volk*. Mention has already been made of the diary found by Reinhold. In it he discovers that the writer's name was Agnes and that her life must have been extremely sad. At various times the name of Agnes reappears in the story; thus Reinhold stumbles upon her grave in Zurich. Finally the riddle is solved partially by the story which Duke Heinrich relates. The latter had been Agnes' lover many years before. At that time political business had forced him to leave her for many months, and in this long period of absence Agnes had borne him a child about which he had known nothing. In an unfortunate hunting accident which had taken place immediately after his return the poor girl had been shot by her lover. The bullet wound had left her insane and undermined her general health so that she had died shortly afterward in Zurich. This we learn from the Duke. Later, in the additional intercalated story of

[1] Cf. Dr. Fritz Karsen, *Henrik Steffens Romane*, p. 78. (*Breslauer Beiträge*, 16. Heft), Leipzig, 1908.

[2] Cf., for example, in *Ritter vom Geiste* the *Ich-Erzählungen* related by Rudhard, 2. Band, 3. Buch, pp. 83–87; by Helene d'Azimont, 2. Band, 4. Buch, pp. 123–33; by Fürst Egon, 2. Band, 5. Buch, pp. 371–74; by Auguste, 3. Band, 5. Buch, pp. 32–39; by Major Werdeck, 3. Band, 6. Buch, pp. 170–73. Cf. also the long intercalation dealing with Rodewald's life, which, however, is not related in the first person, but imparted directly and baldly by the author, 4. Band, 9. Buch, pp. 262–85.

Frau Reinhold, we hear that Reinhold is none other than Agnes' child, and the son of the Duke. We should also mention the fact that a distorted version of the hunting accident had already been narrated by another character, Eberhard Siebenkamm. Thus there are three interpolated stories having to do with Agnes' fate.[1] One is reminded of the various intercalations in *Ritter vom Geiste* which have to do with the fate of the counterfeiter of many aliases, Friedrich Zeck.[2]

But the *Ich-Erzählung* also appears in Meissner's novels where it is not directly linked with the plot. An excellent case of this kind is to be seen in *Feindliche Pole*, in the reminiscences of General Aschberg.[3] They are not necessary to our understanding of the plot, but serve merely as a foil for the principal theme of the book, the contention between Themar, prime-minister of a small German state, and his illegitimate son, Hermann Zoller, who is unacquainted with this relationship. Aschberg informs us of an early love affair of his with a simple English girl. Although she bears him a son, he does not marry her, and she disappears with her child. After many years the General takes part in a campaign of the Crimean war. At a critical moment his life is saved by a young English captive. The General effects the exchange of the youth, who at the last moment discloses his identity to him. He is no other than Aschberg's son, but he refuses to pardon his father for the wrong done his mother. Soon afterward the General orders a redoubt of the enemy stormed. It is captured, but only at the cost of the life of his son who is engaged in defending it. Herr von Themar, to whom the story is told, meditates as follows upon it:[4]

"Schrecklich, schrecklich," dachte er sich, "Solche Conflicte zwischen Vater und Sohn! Jener richtet die Kanonen gegen den Platz, wo sein Vater commandirt, auf die Gefahr hin, ihn tödtlich zu treffen. Zoller's Geschosse sind weniger furchtbar, aber vergiftet und treffen meine Stellung und meine Ehre. Dort hat her Tod die unnatürlichen Verhältnisse gelöst — hier geht der Kampf weiter —."

[1] That of Siebenkamm, pp. 306–12; that of Duke Heinrich, pp. 316–23; that of Frau Reinhold, pp. 328–36.

[2] Cf., *Ritter vom Geiste*, 3. Band, 5. Buch, pp. 28–31; *ibid.*, pp. 39, 40; 3. Band, 7. Buch, pp. 251–66; 3. Band, 7. Buch, p. 277.

[3] *Feindliche Pole*, II, 234–53.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 253.

An intercalated story, which, however, is not related in the first person, is told in *Auf und Nieder*[1] by the scoundrelly Rothaan, who has long desired to obtain the royal favor. But this wish is frustrated by his poverty. He therefore decides to make a rich marriage, and narrates the story of the Italian cavalier, Romagnoli, who obtains an important court position by winning the hand of a rich heiress. An interesting case of similar parallelism may be observed in the short story, *Die wunderlichen Nachbarskinder*, which is interpolated in Goethe's *Wahlverwandtschaften*.[2] For a striking example of the same thing in the literature of more recent times, compare the Arabian tale of Prinz Mondschein in C. F. Meyer's *Der Heilige*.[3] Needless to say, Meyer's technique in the proportioning and the correlating of the intercalated story is far superior to that of Meissner.

Meissner's *Ich-Erzählungen* are introduced in a more or less stereotyped manner, generally with insufficient preparation or motivation. In other words they do not appear naturally in the story, and place must be made for them in a somewhat arbitrary way. Meissner, like Gutzkow, might have learned in this respect from Hauff or from Tieck, many of whose intercalated stories are introduced in a masterly fashion.[4] It is, for instance, difficult to understand just why the conspirator, Negroni, should feel called upon to repeat the tale of his life to Haldenstein and Grauwak.[5] He begins:

"Da wir so gesellig bei einander sitzen," sagte Negroni mit freundlich geglätteten Mienen, "will ich Ihnen wenigstens eine Episode aus meinem Leben zum Besten geben. Dieses Leben, das so vielfach umhergeworfene, erscheint mir selbst oft ein fremdes, seltsames und abenteuerliches Märchen — wenn ich mich je entschliessen könnte, im Alter meine Memoiren zu schreiben, es gäbe vielleicht ein merkwürdiges Buch — doch ich bin an's Verschweigen gewöhnt, und mir graut vor dem blossen Gedanken, meine und anderer Leute Geheimnisse als Waare hinter den Glasfenstern eines Buchladens aufzustellen. Nun, wir sind unter uns. Auch will ich Ihnen nur ein Kapitel erzählen. Vorerst aber müssen Sie im Allgemeinen wissen, wer ich bin und wie ich der geworden, den Sie heute vor sich sehen."

[1] I, 103–9.

[2] See Riemann, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

[3] Cf. Marion Lee Taylor, *A Study of the Technique in Konrad Ferdinand Meyer's Novellen*, pp. 49, 50. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1909.

[4] See Karsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 77, 78.

[5] *Schwarzgelb*, II, 102.

In this passage Negroni admits that he is used to silence, but despite the dangers from spies and treachery, and his own bitter experiences, he does not hesitate to unfold the story of his career to two comparatively strange men.

Just why in *Zwischen Fürst und Volk* the Duke should relate to Schalk the episode of his youth, which he has kept secret all his life, is not clear.[1] We read:[2]

Setzen Sie sich, Schalk! Ich will Ihnen Alles erzählen, und damit dem Vertrauen, das ich Ihnen allerzeit geschenkt habe, die Krone aufsetzen. Sie werden die Geschichte meiner Jugend hören, welche so tief, aber auch so unglücklich wie keine war! Sie werden finden, dass es Zufälle und Umstände giebt, deren plötzliches Eintreffen Verhängnisse erzeugt, so schrecklich, als wenn Dämonen mit dem Menschen spielten und sich über seine Absichten und Zwecke belustigten!

In the actual narration of the *Ich-Erzählungen*, Meissner takes pains that the reader may be aware of the fact that they are merely interpolations within the novel. This he accomplishes by means of little asides, either of the listener or the speaker. Since such interruptions are customary in real life, a certain degree of verisimilitude is thus attained. An example or two will suffice to show the method:

"Verzeihen Sie die Unterbrechung," fiel Grauwak dem Erzähler ins Wort. "Mich lassen meine geographischen Kenntnisse für den Augenblick im Stich, und doch möchte ich, bei dem grossen Interesse, mit welchem ich Ihrer Leidensgeschichte folge, gern wissen, wo eigentlich diese Inseln liegen."[3]

"Erzählen Sie weiter, Durchlaucht," bat Hostiwin, "es war nur ein in mir auftauchender Gedanke."[4]

In the use of such interruptions Meissner's technique is far superior to that of the earlier writer, Henrik Steffens, who employs innumerable and lengthy *Ich-Erzählungen*, but who, unlike Hauff and others, had not acquired from Sir Walter Scott the extremely valuable method of relieving their monotony "durch leidenschaftliche Fragen und Ausrufe des Zuhörers."[5] But our author does not err to the

[1] Cf. Kaiser, *op. cit.*, p. 49: "Die Ich-Erzählungen erscheinen nur dann angebracht, wenn sie sich ungezwungen in den Rahmen des Ganzen einfügen, insbesondere, wenn es der betreffenden Person Bedürfnis ist, sich auszusprechen, oder wenn jemand anders sich teilnehmend erkundigt."

[2] *Zwischen Fürst und Volk*, p. 316.

[3] *Schwarzgelb*, II, 112.

[4] *Sansara*, II, 45.

[5] See Karsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 78, 79.

other extreme as does Gutzkow, who interrupts his intercalated stories with frequent and tedious philosophizings and reflections and even impromptu debate,[1] so that the reading of them is at times rendered quite difficult.

These intercalated stories, which are often of considerable length, are complete in themselves with characters, action, and settings all their own.[2] The characters receive little attention however; the action in which they are involved, is of far more importance.[3] Agnes, for example, does not impress us as a girl with a definite personality. We are told that she has a sweet, gentle nature, and a love for culture and learning, rare in a country woman. But this is not evident from the things she says and does. It is the hunting accident, in which she is wounded, which receives the bulk of the author's attention. The same observation holds true for most of these interpolations: it is not the personages, but the things which happen to them, which are of most interest to the author. And these things, usually, as in the case of Aschberg and his son, are highly improbable. These intercalations, in spite of the information they may bring, tend further to interrupt and delay the main story and force the reader to think of two actions concurrently with the resulting danger that the theme proper be confused. Since the events of the intercalated story have occurred before those related in the chief action of the novel, the chronological sequence of the plot is also seriously disturbed. Indeed, whatever may be said as to the merits of the other styles of intercalation, it is certain that Meissner's *Ich-Erzählungen* represent a distinct blemish in his novelistic technique.

ARTHUR ROLLINS GRAVES

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

[1] Cf. *Ritter vom Geiste*, 3. Band, 7. Buch, pp. 251–66 (Murray's *Erzählung*).

[2] For other examples, cf. *Neuer Adel*, III, 179–92; *Babel*, II, 130–37; *Kinder Roms*, II, 130–39; *ibid.*, IV, 80–102; *ibid.*, IV, 196–201; *Feindliche Pole*, I, 127–35.

[3] The *Ich-Erzählung* in *Sansara*, IV, 184–200, constitutes an exception to this statement. It is excellently introduced and correlated with the story, nor are the characters subordinated to the action.

12. ZUSAMMENFASSUNG.—Die bisherigen Erwägungen haben das Folgende ergeben:

In keiner Sprache stösst der bisherige Ansatz auf eine Unmöglichkeit; andernfalls wäre er durch das Nachdenken der Sprachforscher längst beseitigt worden. Doch sprechen gegen ihn diese Gründe:

1. *bh, dh, gh* müssen ohne Erklärung bald als Verschlusslaute mit stimmhaftem, bald mit stimmlosem Hauch aufgefasst werden, und beide Auffassungen sind phonetisch fraglich.

2. Die Entwicklung von *bh* zu *b* usw. widerspricht im Germanischen und Armenischen der Richtung der Lautverschiebung.

3. Andrerseits widerspricht die Entwicklung zu *ph* (die zum Germanischen und Armenischen passen würde) der griechischen Sprechart, in geringerem Masse auch der italischen.

4. Der Zeitunterschied in der Vollendung des Lautwandels von *bh* zu *ph* zu *f* (zu *b*) im Griechischen und Lateinischen ist auffällig gross.

5. Die germanische Entwicklungsrichtung deutet nicht auf stimmhafte Aspiraten, sondern mit der grössten Deutlichkeit auf stimmlose Spiranten; die Stimmlosigkeit wird auch durch das Italische und Griechische gefordert, während alle andern Sprachen eher auf stimmhafte Spiranten weisen würden; dieser Widerspruch löst sich aber durch § 14.

6. *bh, dh, gh* kommen in nicht-arischen Nachbarsprachen des Indischen, aber sonst nirgends in der Welt vor; das macht die indischen stimmhaften Aspiraten der Entlehnung verdächtig.

Ich halte dafür, dass diese Gründe den Versuch rechtfertigen, zu prüfen, wie sich der Ansatz von stimmlosen Spiranten statt der aspirierten Medien auf die einzelsprachlichen Verhältnisse anwenden lässt.

III. *bh, dh, gh* ALS STIMMLOSE SPIRANTEN.

13. ZUR UMSCHRIFT.—In den bisherigen Teilen dieser Abhandlung habe ich mich aus praktischen Gründen im allgemeinen an die

gebräuchlichsten Umschriften gehalten; in den folgenden Auseinandersetzungen aber wird es vielfach nötig sein, zwischen lenes und fortes klar zu unterscheiden. Die gewöhnlichen Mittel der Umschrift reichen dazu schlecht aus, denn sprachwissenschaftliche Werke pflegen diese Laute überhaupt nicht zu unterscheiden, und die im System der internationalen phonetischen Vereinigung angewandte Lenisbezeichnung (Kreis unter dem Buchstaben, z.B. b̥) ist aus typographischen Gründen für viele Buchstabenformen recht ungeeignet. Ausserdem wäre es sicher besser, für jede lenis ein einheitliches alphabetisches Symbol statt eines Buchstabens mit diakritischem Zeichen zu haben. Daher verwende ich in den weiteren Abschnitten diese Zeichen:

f, *þ*, *ĥ* = stimmlose Fortes-Spiranten, *φ*, *θ*, *χ* = stimmlose Lenes-Spiranten.

p, *t*, *k* = stimmlose Fortes-Verschlusslaute, *π*, *τ*, *κ* = stimmlose Lenes-Verschlusslaute.

b, *d*, *g* = stimmhafte Verschlusslaute, *β*, *δ*, *γ* = stimmhafte Spiranten.

Der griechische Buchstabe bezeichnet also überall dem lateinischen (bzw. germanischen) gegenüber eine Minderung der Artikulationsenergie; bei stimmlosen Lauten äussert sich diese als Gegensatz zwischen fortis und lenis, bei stimmhaften naturgemäss als Gegensatz zwischen Verschlusslaut und Spirans. Die angewandten Zeichen nähern sich einigermassen der lautlichen Geltung, die ihnen in modernen Sprachen zukommt.—Gewiss wird man mir die Verwendung abweichender Transkription nicht als Eigenbrötelei auslegen. Ich bin aufs Äusserste gegen die Aufstellung individueller neuer Umschriftarten eingenommen. Aber die Bedürfnisse gerade der vorliegenden Arbeit machten es gar zu schwer, mit den gebräuchlichen Zeichen auszukommen. Und schliesslich ist ja die Neuerung nicht gross. Im grossen und ganzen handelt es sich um die konsequentere Durchführung bestehender Gewohnheiten. *θ* wird namentlich von romanischen Phonetikern vielfach für *þ* gebraucht, *χ* fast allgemein für die velare Spirans; die Verwendung dieses Zeichens für die lenis (sonst wird es ja ohne Unterschied für lenis und fortis gebraucht) machte ein neues Zeichen für die fortis unvermeidlich. Will jemand ein besseres Zeichen für diese vorschlagen, so soll es mich

freuen; mir gefällt mein Zeichen nicht, aber mit dem [x] der phonetischen Vereinigung kann ich mich für sprachwissenschaftliche Zwecke noch weniger befreunden.—γ wird häufig, β und δ nicht sehr selten für die stimmhafte Spirans verwendet. π, τ, κ als lenes den fortes p, t, k gegenüberzustellen, mag am ehesten bedenklich erscheinen, empfiehlt sich aber wegen der Analogie von ϕ, θ, χ gegen f, $\not{p}$, $\not{h}$.

Zum System der internationalen phonetischen Vereinigung würden sich diese Zeichen folgendermassen verhalten:

$f, \not{p}, \not{h}$ = [f, p, x], ϕ, θ, χ = [$\underset{\circ}{v}$, $\underset{\circ}{\eth}$, $\mathring{g}$]

p, t, k = [p, t, k], π, τ, κ = [$\underset{\circ}{b}$, $\underset{\circ}{d}$, $\mathring{g}$]

b, d, g = [b, d, g], β, δ, γ = [v, $\eth$, g]

(Zwischen labialem und labiodentalem f zu unterscheiden, ist hier nicht erforderlich, wenn nötig, liesse sich für die fortis das internationale Zeichen [F], für die lenis griechisch $\digamma$ verwenden.)

14. PHONETISCHE BEMERKUNGEN.—Alle Änderungen der Artikulationsart von Verschlusslauten oder Spiranten schliessen notwendigerweise eine Steigerung oder Minderung der Artikulationsenergie in sich. Diese kann verschiedener Art sein:

1. Der Atemdruck wird gesteigert oder gemindert.
2. Die Muskelspannung wird gesteigert oder gemindert.
3. Es tritt eine Verbindung zweier Faktoren ein.

Aussprachesteigerung ist also Zunahme des Druckes oder der Spannung oder beider Faktoren.

Aussprachemінderung ist eine Abnahme des Druckes oder der Spannung oder beider Faktoren.

A. STEIGERUNG.—Die Unterscheidung von Expirationsdruck und Muskelspannung ist nur eine äusserliche. "Druck" beruht auf der Tätigkeit von Rumpfmuskeln; "Spannung" im phonetischen Sinne wird auf die Muskeln der Glottis oder des Ansatzrohres bezogen.—Auf grund theoretischer Erwägungen wie nach Ausweis der wirklichen Sprachänderungen entspricht die Reihenfolge der Steigerungsvorgänge dem Kräfteverhältnis der betreffenden Muskelpartieen. Das bedeutet: Bei Steigerung ist Druck der primäre, Spannung der sekundäre Faktor; solange Drucksteigerung möglich ist, tritt sie ein, begleitet von einer Spannungssteigerung, die lediglich Reaktion gegen

sie ist; ist Drucksteigerung nicht möglich, so erfolgt Spannungssteigerung als bestimmender Faktor. Steigerungen gehen also von der Lunge aus, sodann erfolgt Spannung der Stimmbänder, und Spannung von Mundmuskeln tritt zuletzt ein (in diesem Satze ist auf Reaktionsspannung keine Rücksicht genommen, sondern nur auf Spannung als bestimmenden Faktor).

Geht man beispielsweise von dem Verschlusslaut *t* aus, so ergeben sich folgende Änderungen:

1. Drucksteigerung führt zur Aspiration (wobei Spannungssteigerung meist als Reaktion miterfolgt), weitere Drucksteigerung löst den Verschluss: $t > th > \dot{p}$.

Die stimmlose Spirans ist ein vorläufiges Maximum. Sie ist aus stärkstem Druck hervorgegangen, dem eine normale Spannung der relativ schwachen Muskeln des Zungenblattes endlich nicht mehr Widerstand leistet; ob zwischen *th* und *p* eine Affrikata (*tp*) eintritt, hängt von besonderen Umständen ab, die ich *JEGPh*, XVI, 14 f., auseinandergesetzt habe, die aber hier nicht in Betracht kommen.— Der Vorgang lässt sich an dem Bilde eines Dampfkessels gut versinnlichen: der Dampfdruck nimmt zu, bis das Sicherheitsventil durch ihn geöffnet wird. Eine weitere Steigerung ist nicht möglich; vielmehr tritt infolge des Mangels an Widerstand Druckminderung ein. Auf die Sprache bezogen heisst das: Drucksteigerung hat zur Lösung des Verschlusses geführt; das Gegenwirken von Höchstdruck und Höchstspannung wird unter gewöhnlichen Sprechverhältnissen nicht andauernd beibehalten. Durch naturgemässe Druckminderung, die von entsprechender Spannungsminderung (Reaktion) begleitet wird, tritt lenis für fortis ein: Wenigstens ist dies die normale Entwicklung. Besondere Umstände können sie verhindern oder ändern.

2. Glottis und Ansatzrohr bieten nun dem Atem freien Weg. Drucksteigerung kann darum vorläufig nicht mehr eintreten, vielmehr erfolgt nun Spannungssteigerung, und zwar, wie oben gesagt, zunächst in der Glottis. Die Stimmbänder schliessen sich, der Laut wird stimmhaft: $\theta > \delta$.

3. Durch den Glottisverschluss (darunter verstehe ich hier natürlich nicht "Kehlkopfverschluss" im technischen Sinne, sondern den zum Schwingen der Stimmbänder führenden lockern Verschluss) ist der Atemdruck gehemmt und daher geschwächt. Gegen diesen

schwächeren Druck vermag Spannung der Zungenmuskeln einen Verschluss herzustellen; man könnte sagen: das Sicherheitsventil schliest sich durch seine Federkraft: $\delta > d$.

4. Der Atem ist nun sowohl in der Glottis als auch im Ansatzrohr gehemmt. Dadurch tritt eine neue Möglichkeit der Drucksteigerung ein. Durch vermehrten Druck öffnet sich die Glottis (nicht das Ansatzrohr, denn erst muss dem Atem an der ersten Hemmungsstelle freier Weg geschaffen werden), sodass der Laut stimmlos wird: $d > \tau$.

5. Der Druck nimmt weiter zu, solange im Ansatzrohr ein Verschluss ist. Unter gleichzeitiger Spannungssteigerung (Reaktion) wird die lenis zur fortis: $\tau > t$.

Die fortis wird weiter zur aspirata—zur stimmlosen spirans fortis —durch naturgemässe Druck- und Spannungsminderung zur stimmlosen spirans lenis—zur stimmhaften Spirans usw.

Somit ergibt sich diese Entwicklungsreihe der Steigerungsvorgänge:[1]

$$t > th > þ > \theta > \delta > d > \tau > t > th \ldots$$
$$p > ph > f\,[> \phi > \beta > b > \pi > p > ph \ldots$$
$$k > kh > \hbar\,[> \chi\,[> \gamma > g > \kappa > k > kh \ldots$$

(Das Trennungszeichen [will andeuten, dass die Entwicklung der linken und der rechten Seite für sich zwar gesichert und notwendig ist, die Verbindung der beiden Seiten dagegen durch gewisse Bedingungen gestört werden kann. Für den gegenwärtigen Zweck aber soll allein die ungestörte Entwicklung der ganzen Reihen in Betracht gezogen werden; ich nehme daher z.B. keine Rücksicht darauf, dass der labiale Spirant labiodental werden, der velare Spirant infolge der besonderen Weichheit der Muskeln des Zungenrückens zu *h* werden kann; in beiden Fällen ist natürlich die weitere Entwicklung behindert.)

Sprachliche Belege für diese Reihen werden später gegeben.

Aus dem Gesagten leiten sich folgende Grundsätze ab:

1. **Was** wird verstärkt?—Solange ein Verschluss da ist (wie gesagt, gilt Schwingungsstellung der Stimmbänder als Verschluss), tritt *Drucksteigerung* ein; fehlt der Verschluss, so tritt *Spannungssteigerung* ein. Das heisst:

Bei *Verschlusslauten* wächst der *Atemdruck:* $t > th > þ$; $d > \tau > t$.

Bei *Spiranten* wächst die *Spannung:* $\theta > \delta > d$.

[1] $þ > \theta$ ist natürlich eine Minderung, doch gehört sie in die Steigerungsreihe, weil sie eine normale Entwicklung aus der Verbindung zweier Steigerungsmaxima ist, wie oben ausgeführt.

2. **Wo** wird verstärkt?—Verschluss*lösung* tritt dort ein, wo der Atemstrom das erste Hindernis findet; das heisst, bei *stimmhaften* Lauten in der *Glottis*, bei *stimmlosen* (wo eben nur eine Hemmungsstelle da ist) im *Ansatzrohr*.—Verschluss*bildung* tritt dort ein, wo dem Atemstrom das erste Hindernis geboten werden kann, d.h. bei *stimmlosen* Lauten in der Glottis, bei *stimmhaften* Lauten im Ansatzrohr; Lösung: $d>\tau$, $t>p$, Verschluss: $p>\delta$, $\delta>d$.

Darin liegt keine Spur einer neuen Theorie, noch nicht einmal ein neuer Gedanke. Es ist nur eine neue Aneinanderreihung von Selbstverständlichem und Altbekanntem; trotzdem musste es einmal in dieser Form gesagt werden.

Man kann das Gesagte in dieses Schema zusammenstellen:
Durch Steigerung der Artikulationsenergie erfolgt:

Bei stimm**losen Verschluss**lauten—Lösung —im Ansatzrohr.
Bei stimm**haften** " " — " —in der Glottis.
Bei stimm**losen Spiranten** —Verschluss—in der Glottis.
Bei stimm**haften** " — " —im Ansatzrohr.

Zum Beispiel: angenommenes idg. **φerō* entwickelt sich so:

φ: stimmloser Spirant—Verschluss in der Glottis: germ. **βeran.*
β: stimmhafter Spirant—Verschluss im Ansatzrohr: got. *bairan.*
b: stimmhafter Verschlusslaut—Lösung in der Glottis: obd. *πeran.*
Oder idg. **u̯rt̨nt:*
t: stimmloser Verschlusslaut—Lösung im Ansatzrohr: germ. **wurθun.*
θ: stimmloser Spirant—Verschluss in der Glottis: germ. **wurδun.*
δ: stimmhafter Spirant—Verschluss im Ansatzrohr: as. *wurdun.*
d: stimmhafter Verschlusslaut—Lösung in der Glottis: ahd. *wurtun.*

B. Minderung.—Die Steigerungsvorgänge bieten ein Bild der höchsten Einfachheit und Folgerichtigkeit. Minderung der Artikulationsenergie lässt sich nicht ganz so eindeutig darstellen. Eine Auseinandersetzung der zum Teil recht verwickelten Übergänge (nebst den Veränderungen der Artikulations*stelle* und Artikulations*form*) habe ich im Manuskript ausgearbeitet, doch da sie zum Thema in weniger enger Beziehung steht, will ich sie mit Rücksicht auf den

kostbaren Raum hier beiseite lassen und nur einige wesentliche Punkte daraus anführen:

1. Stimmlose Verschlusslaute werden durch Minderung von Druck und Spannung zu lenes, weiterhin durch gewissermassen automatische Glottisverengung (die namentlich zwischen stimmhaften Lauten eintritt) stimmhaft: lat. *amatum* > asp. *amado*.—Aber durch Spannungsminderung bei fortdauerndem Druck werden sie zu stimmlosen Spiranten, was jedenfalls in der spätgriechischen Wandlung von *ph*, *th*, *kh* zu Spiranten vorliegt; ein besonders klares Beispiel bietet die irische "Lenierung" von zwischenvokalischem *p*, *t*, *k* (z.B. lat. *pater:* air. *athir*).

2. Stimmlose Spiranten werden durch Druckminderung bei gleichbleibender (oder steigender) Spannung zu stimmlosen Verschlusslauten, dagegen zu stimmhaften Spiranten, wenn die Spannung gleichzeitig im Ansatzrohr abnimmt, in der Glottis automatisch zunimmt. Das erstere liegt vor in der neunordischen Wandlung von anlautendem *θ* zu *t* (engl. *think:* schwed. *tänka*), das letztere in der Schwächung von engl. *θ* zu *δ* in schwachtonigen Wörtern wie dem Artikel.

3. Stimmhafte Verschlusslaute werden durch Spannungsminderung im Ansatzrohr zu stimmhaften Spiranten: asp. *amado* > neusp. *amaδo*.

4. Stimmhafte Spiranten sind schon Minima von Spannung und von Druck. Weitere Minderung führt zum Wegfall (*amaδo* > *amao*).

Wie man sieht, sind einige Änderungen doppeldeutig, und es kommt im einzelnen Falle auf den allgemeinen Sprachcharakter an, ob sie als Steigerung oder Minderung zu gelten haben: so kann sich *þ* (*θ*) aus *t* durch Drucksteigerung oder durch Spannungsminderung ergeben, und *þ* kann durch Spannungssteigerung oder durch Druckminderung (vergleiche Verners Gesetz und den englischen Artikel) stimmhaft werden.—Wem dies auffällig scheint, der denke daran, dass man bei einer Wage das Gleiche erreicht, wenn man links Gewichte zulegt oder rechts Gewichte wegnimmt.

* * *

Auf grund dieser Darlegungen ist nun die Entwicklung der versuchsweise angesetzten schwachen stimmlosen Spiranten in den

einzelnen Sprachen zu betrachten. Die Frage ist also die, ob unsere Annahme die folgenden Gleichungen erklärt:[1]

idg.	ai.	slav.	arm.	gr.	lat.	germ.
ϕ	*bh*	*b*	*b*	*ph*	*f*	β
θ	*dh*	*d*	*d*	*th*	*f*	δ
χ	*gh*	*g*	*g*	*kh*	*h*	γ

15. Indisch.—Die in § 7 aufgestellte Vermutung, dass ai. *bh*, *dh*, *gh* vielleicht nicht lautliche Entwicklungen, sondern Lautübertragungen sein könnten, ist für den Gang dieser Untersuchung keine Notwendigkeit. Gerade *weil* uns der vorhistorische Lautcharakter der angenommenen mediae aspiratae nicht sicher bekannt ist, muss ihre phonetische Entwicklung aus andern Lauten als denkbar zugegeben werden; was wir nicht näher kennen, darüber müssen wir eben alles Mögliche zugeben. Zum Beispiel wäre nichts Unwahrscheinliches an der Annahme, dass sie aus den stimmhaften Spiranten β, δ, γ auf dem Wege über Affrikaten (Meringers $b\beta$, $g\gamma$, allerdings lieber $d\delta$ als sein *dz*) hervorgegangen seien: in diesem Falle hätte die Lautsteigerung (Verschlussbildung im Ansatzrohr) zunächst nur den Beginn des Lautes betroffen, während sein Abglitt mehr und mehr mit Mundöffnung statt mit Spirantenenge gesprochen wurde; wir müssten dann an eine ältere Periode der Spannungssteigerung und eine jüngere Periode der Spannungsminderung im Indischen glauben; Indisch wäre gewissermassen auf halbem Wege stehen geblieben, während Iranisch die Verschlussbildung beendet hätte. Das ist eben eine jener physiologischen Konstruktionen, die sich weder beweisen noch widerlegen, aber auch nicht durch Einfügung in grössere Zusammenhänge als folgerichtig begründen lassen. Persönlich scheint mir Lautübertragung der ganzen Sachlage nach sehr viel wahrscheinlicher, doch sehe ich nicht, wie sich darüber zu voller Gewissheit kommen liesse. Auf jeden Fall ist aber sowohl für Lautentwicklung wie für Lautübertragung von stimmhaften, nicht von stimmlosen Spiranten auszugehen. Waren ϕ, θ, χ die ursprachlichen Laute, so sind sie schon in vorindischer Zeit (in dem Dialekte des Indogermanischen, der zum Indischen führte) in der in § 14 angegebenen Weise (das würde in diesem Falle sowohl Lautsteigerung wie -minderung zulassen; weiteres in § 20) stimmhaft geworden.

[1] Slav. gilt hier als Vertreter aller Sprachen, in denen die Medien und aspirierten Medien zusammenfallen.—Auf die kleineren idg. Sprachen wie Tocharisch, Phrygisch, Makedonisch, Venetisch usw. ist verzichtet. Über Tocharisch lässt sich nichts sagen, die andern scheinen dem Slavischen in diesem Punkte gleich zu sein.

Es gibt, wie schon oben gesagt, kein indisches Lautgesetz, das diesen Ansatz mit zwingender Notwendigkeit fordern würde. Hauchumstellung und Hauchdissimilation lassen sich mit Annahme von *bh, dh, gh* erklären, ebenso gut aber mit Annahme von $\phi, \theta, \chi > \beta, \delta, \gamma$, sodass sich aus diesen Lautgesetzen kein Anhalt für die Datierung des Überganges der stimmhaften Spiranten in *bh, dh, gh* gewinnen lässt. Nimmt man an, dass die Hauchdissimilation zu einer Zeit stattfand, in der noch stimmhafte Spiranten gesprochen wurden, so ist der Übergang leicht verständlich: **βaβūva* muss doch geradesogut zur Dissimilation geneigt haben wie **bhabhūva*, und da der Anlaut mehr Spannung zu zeigen pflegt als der Inlaut, ist die Richtung der Dissimilation gegeben. Ebenso ist bei Annahme von mehr Spannung als Druck (was zum Altindischen passt) die Entwicklung von $\gamma t > \gamma d > \gamma\delta > g\delta > gdh$ mindestens ebenso gut möglich wie die von $ght > ghd > gdh$.

Und doch findet sich eine Frage der altindischen Lautgeschichte, die sich mit Annahme von Spiranten leichter lösen lässt als mit der bisherigen Auffassung. Indogermanisches palatales wie urarisches palatalisiertes *"gh"* wird ai. zu *h*, während die palatalen reinen Medien zu *j*=[d'ž] werden. Die Aufstellung einer indischen Zwischenstufe *jh* zwischen *g'h* und *h* erklärt diesen Unterschied der Behandlung nur dem Schriftbilde nach, aber nicht in Wirklichkeit, als lautlichen Vorgang. Denn ai. *j*=[d'ž][1] ist ein "mouillierter Laut"; wie sich aus den schönen Erklärungen der Mouillierung bei Sievers (*Gr*, S. 187) und Bremer (*Deutsche Phonetik*, S. 64 f.) leicht verstehen lässt, ist bei jedem mouillierten Verschlusslaut ein Abglitt in Gestalt eines Reibelautes unvermeidlich; je nach der Art der Zungenspannung kann dieser ein Rillenlaut, [ž] oder ein Spaltlaut, [j] sein, aber als selbstständige Laute darf man diese Abglitte nicht auffassen; [d'ž, d'j=ȷ] sind geradesogut einheitliche Laute wie etwa aspiriertes *t* oder unser *dh*. Man kann mit gutem Rechte sagen, der palatale Abglitt eines mouillierten Lautes entspreche genau dem *h* einer Aspirata, sodass ein ai. *j*=[dž] schon an und für sich als aspiriert gelten muss. Zwischen ai. *j* und **jh* besteht also vom lautlichen

[1] Es ist sehr ärgerlich, dass die gebräuchliche Umschrift des ai., dem englischen Lautwerte gemäss, *j* für einen palatalen Verschlusslaut mit Abglitt, nämlich für [d'ž] verwendet. Hier wie an andrer Stelle versuche ich ein Missverständnis dadurch zu vermeiden, dass ich, dem Gebrauch der meisten Phonetiker folgend, Lautschrift durch eckige Klammern bezeichne. [j] bedeutet also den palatalen Spiranten (in deutsch *ja*), *j* dagegen den altindischen Laut, der phonetisch gleich [d'ž] ist.

Standpunkte kein grundsätzlicher Unterschied. Höchstens mag man darauf bestehen, dass der Abglitt des *jh* grössere Artikulationsenergie verlange als der des *j;* das würde aber zu allem eher als zu einem *h* führen—zu einem [d′j]—gleich dem *gy* des Ungarischen—am ehesten. Setzt man aber eine urarische stimmhafte Spirans ein, so wird die Sache verständlich, ja fast notwendig. Ein palataler Spirant γ' ist ja weiter nichts als echtes [j] (wohl ursprünglich mit enger Aussprache wie im Norddeutschen), also eine Spirans ohne Verschlusseinsatz. Der Neigung aller Satemsprachen folgend, wird dieses wohl im Urarischen mit flacher Rille, also als [ž], gesprochen worden sein, das dann im Iranischen zum engen Rillenlaut [z] wurde; dafür bietet das Romanische und Slavische Parallelen in Menge; vgl. Verf. *IF*, XXXIII, 377. Im Indischen dagegen, das zu Rillenbildung weit weniger neigt als das Iranische (vgl. Bloomfield, *AJPh*, a. o. O.), trat Spannungsminderung und dadurch Entwicklung zu *h* ein; in derselben Weise wurde im Griechischen idg. *i̯* zu *h*, wo nicht durch die umgebenden Laute die Spannung geschützt wurde, sodass Entwicklung zu ζ erfolgte, und wurde im Böhmischen *g* (über Spirans) zu stimmhaften *h*, χ im Germanischen zu stimmlosem *h* usw. Der Unterschied in der Entwicklung des Verschlusslautes *g′* zu [d′ž], des Spiranten γ' dagegen zu *h* ist also wohl verständlich, aber bei Annahme von Aspiraten kann ich wenigstens den Unterschied zwischen ai. *j* und *h* nicht begreifen.—Auch das ist nicht auffällig, dass für den nicht-palatalen Laut *gh* substituiert wurde, während sich der palatale Laut organisch zu *h* entwickelte: es bestand eine Klangähnlichkeit wohl zwischen arisch γ und einheimisch *gh*, aber nicht zwischen [j] und *gh*.

Unsere Deutung setzt voraus, dass die Hauchdissimilation in eine urarische Zeit, vor der arischen Palatalisierung, gesetzt wird, also als ursprünglich arisches Lautgesetz aufgefasst wird, das jedoch im Iranischen durch den Zusammenfall der Medien und "aspirierten Medien" verwischt wurde. Ai. *jahāti* geht also zurück auf ein urar. *$\gamma' e\gamma' \bar{e}ti$ > *$g' e\gamma' \bar{e}ti$ > *[d′žažāti].

So legt uns wenigstens Ein Punkt des indischen Lautstandes die Auffassung nahe, palatales *gh*, und damit doch wohl *gh* überhaupt, sei Spirant gewesen. Doch lässt das Indische nicht auf stimmlose, sondern nur auf stimmhafte Spirans schliessen.

16. Die Sprachen mit *b, d, g*.—Fünf Gruppen des Idg., nämlich Iranisch, Balto-Slavisch, Albanesisch, Keltisch, Armenisch, haben *b, d, g* als Vertreter von idg. *φ, θ, χ*. In der teilweisen Vertretung dieser Laute und des idg. *b, d, g* durch *β, δ, γ* werden wir jedenfalls nicht eine Bewahrung des Alten, sondern eine spätere Lautminderung zu erblicken haben, wie ja auch im Bairischen germanisch *-β-* zuerst zum Verschlusslaut *b*, *π*, später aber wieder zum Reibelaut *β* wurde.

Das Armenische, ebenso wie das Germanische, besitzt eine Lautverschiebung, das heisst eine allgemeine Lautsteigerung der indogermanischen Verschlusslaute. Nach § 14 müssen wir *β, δ, γ* als Steigerungsvorstufe von *b, d, g* auffassen. Für das Armenische ist also als folgerichtiger Teil der Lautverschiebung die Reihe *φ, θ, χ* > *β, δ, γ* > *b, d, g* anzunehmen. Es lässt sich kein sicherer Grund denken, warum es in den andern vier Gruppen anders gewesen sein sollte. Wir tun also wohl am besten, für alle fünf Gruppen von stimmhaften Spiranten auszugehen. Dass diese ihrerseits von stimmlosen Spiranten kommen, lässt sich vom einzelsprachlichen Standpunkte zwar nur für das Armenische wahrscheinlich machen, weil nur dieses eine Anwendung der Steigerungsreihe von § 14 rechtfertigt, aber selbstverständlich muss der für eine Sprache gewonnene Ausgangslaut verallgemeinert werden. Weiteres darüber in § 20.

17. Griechisch.—Der Übergang von stimmlosen Spiranten in stimmlose Verschlusslaute mag auf den ersten Blick auffällig erscheinen. Er ist aber in zweierlei Spracherscheinungen historisch belegt:

Erstens sind stimmlose Spiranten keineswegs häufige Laute; Sprachen, die den einen oder den andern dieser Laute nicht besitzen, pflegen bei der Aussprache von Fremdwörtern dafür Verschlusslaute zu substituieren, und zwar in Nachahmung des Klangeindruckes am öftesten aspirierte (sogar manchmal affrizierte). So ist das ganz allgemein der Fall bei der Aussprache des deutschen *ch* durch Engländer, Romanen usw. Für das englische *th* pflegen Deutsche *t* zu gebrauchen. Für *f* in deutschen Wörtern wird im Litauischen *p*, im (älteren) Slavischen *b* eingesetzt.

Zweitens fehlt es auch nicht an Beispielen einer lautlichen Entwicklung dieser Art. Sie erklären sich aus Minderung des Druckes bei gleichbleibender, vielleicht sogar wachsender Spannung (§ 14).

So wird anlautendes θ—im Anlaut ist die Spannung am grössten, relativ wie absolut—im Neunordischen zu t (während, was für die Minderungstendenz dieser Sprachen bezeichnend ist, stimmlose inlautende Spiranten in stimmhafter Umgebung stimmhaft wurden, später aber teilweise schwanden). Im Neugriechischen ist der Übergang häufig; Belege dafür finden sich in Menge (für θ zu τ und den selteneren Übergang von χ zu κ siehe Mullach, *Grammatik der griechischen Vulgärsprache*, S. 28, 89, 94; Foy, *Lautsystem der griechischen Vulgärsprache*, S. 6, 7, 9; Ascoli, *VL*, S. 133 ff.; Kretschmer, *Der heutige lesbische Dialekt*, S. 157; bei Foy, S. 11, werden auch Belege für den Wandel von ϕ zu π gegeben). Bei den Dentalen ist der Übergang begreiflicherweise viel verbreiteter als bei den Labialen und Velaren. Das liegt daran, dass Lautveränderungen dieser Art überhaupt von den Dentalen auszugehen pflegen und bei ihnen am weitesten gehen (vgl. Verf. *JEGPh*, XVI, 11 und 14), und daran, dass labiale Spiranten gern labiodental, velare Spiranten wegen der Weichheit der Muskeln des Zungenrückens leicht zu h werden, Verwandlungen, die dem Übergang in Verschlusslaute hinderlich sind.

E. Prokosch

University of Texas

[To be concluded]

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVI *November 1918* NUMBER 7

PELLES, PELLINOR, AND PELLEAN IN THE OLD FRENCH ARTHURIAN ROMANCES

II. *Pellinor.*

I will say at once that, in my opinion, Pellinor is the invention of the author of the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation. Except as a variant in two MSS for the passage of the *Queste*, VI, 150, the name occurs only in the *Merlin* continuations of the Vulgate cycle, MS 337 and the pseudo-Robert de Borron cycle (i.e., Huth *Merlin*, Spanish *Demanda*) and in the prose *Tristan*. Now, of these works the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation is unquestionably the earliest,[1] and it seems most natural to assume that the character was adopted from this branch by the rest. Indeed, only in the case of the *Merlin* of the pseudo-Robert de Borron cycle is the question debatable, and we shall return to that in a moment.

[1] Cf. E. Brugger, *Zeitschr. für franz. Sprache und Litt.*, XXVIII (1905), 57 f., for relations of the *Merlin* continuation of MS 337 to that of the Vulgate cycle. *Ibid.*, XXIX (1905), 109, he expresses the opinion that the Huth *Merlin* is entirely independent of the Vulgate. So, too, G. Paris, p. lxiv of the Introduction to the Huth *Merlin* (Paris, 1886). But the pseudo-Robert cycle (to which the Huth *Merlin* belongs) with its *Tristan* contaminations, is certainly later than the Vulgate cycle. Observe, too, what I have said above, p. 113, note, on the lateness of this cycle as compared with the Vulgate. In his well-known treatise, *Über die verschiedenen Redaktionen des Robert von Borron zugeschriebenen Graal-Lancelot-Cyklus* (Halle, 1895), E. Wechssler assumes throughout that the Vulgate and the so-called Robert de Borron cycle are both derived from a common source—i.e., an antecedent cycle that has been lost—but he gives no proof of this assumption. He recognizes, however, explicitly (pp. 5, 18, *et passim*) that the prose *Tristan* influenced the second of the above-named cycles—hence was anterior to it. Later redactions of the *Tristan*, he thinks, were in turn influenced by the pseudo-Robert cycle.

The name first occurs in the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation, II, 125, where Brangoire, addressing the rebel kings about the Saxon invasion, says:

> ne par decha du roy peiles de listenois natendons nous nul secors car il garde le roy pelinoir son frere qui gist malades dun mal dont iamais naura garison tant que cil vendra laiens qui les auentures du saint graal metera a fin. ne del roy alain qui gist malades natendons nous nul secors deuant ce que li mieudres cheualiers del monde uiegne a lui & li demant dont cele maladie li vint & quel chose li graus est que len sert.

And again we read (*ibid.*, II, 159) that Guinevere is the wisest, loveliest, and best-loved woman of "la bloie bretaigne," except "elaine sans per le feme persides le rous" and the daughter of Pelles. The text, however, which Sommer is following in his edition of the Vulgate cycle, is corrupt in this place, and we shall have to reproduce the reading of MS 747 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, as given by him in *Modern Philology*, V, 305. Here, too, it is said that only two women of her time were comparable to Guinevere, viz., "Helainne sans per qui fu feme persides le rous," and

> la fille le roi pelles de listenois del chastel de corbenyc, qui fu niece le riche roi pescheor & le roi malade de plaies dont li uns ert apelez alains des illes an listenois. & cil ert malades de maladies de plaies & li rīches rois qui estoit apelez mehaigniez estoit naurez parmi les .ii. cuisses de la lance uengeresse & fu apelez par son droit non quant il estoit en sante li rois pellinor de listenois. & li rois alains & li rois pelinor si furent frere germain & cele pucele dont ie uos di si estoit lor niece & fille le roi pelles qui frere (estoit) a ces .ii. dont ie uos ai dit. icele pucelle fu la plus bele que len ueist onques an la terre & la plus nete. icele garda le santisme graal iusquitel ior que galaad fu engendrez.

We find Pellinor still further in the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation as the name of a brother of Pelles in the following passages, II, 359 (Pellinor de la saluage forest souuraine), where he is said to have had eleven sons of at least seventeen years of age, also a twelfth, who had not come to court, and the mother was now pregnant with the thirteenth, page 374 (Pellinor de Listenois), page 384 (Pellinor de la terre gaste). He is doubtless alluded to, though not named, in the following passages: II, 221, where a knight is described as kinsman

"al roy pelles de listenois & a ses freres," and II, 346, where he is described as Eliezer's uncle, wounded in the thighs.

What led the author of this *Merlin* continuation of the Vulgate cycle to invent the new brother of Pelles? In seeking an answer to this question one should remember that this branch is, as is generally agreed, the last part of the Vulgate cycle to be composed. The author, accordingly, had before him the *Estoire del Saint Graal*, in which (I, 252) Alain is called the *roi pescheor*, and, on the other hand, the prose *Lancelot* and *Queste*, in which Pelles was the *roi pescheor*. Furthermore, he had in his texts the *roi mahaignie*, who was, generally speaking, not given a specific name in any of the branches of the cycle before the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation itself. The only exceptions in this vast extent of material are the following:

1. *Estoire del Saint Graal*, I, 290, where in Sommer's text he is called Pelleam, although in the manuscript followed by Hucher, *Le Saint Graal*, III, 295, he is son of Pelleam and unnamed. I shall return to this exception in the discussion of Pelleam's (Pellean's) name.

2. Prose *Lancelot*, III, 29, where he is called Pelles. But this passage, with its *Queste* references, certainly did not belong to the *Lancelot* in its original form. It is an obvious interpolation and contains another gross blunder besides this identification of Pelles with the Maimed King, viz., in making Amide or Helizabel both Galahad's mother and his sister.

3. *Queste*, VI, 150. I have discussed this passage above.

The author of the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation, therefore, found in his texts two *rois pescheors*, Alain and Pelles, and an unnamed *roi mahaignie*. Pelles, however, was far more important in the Vulgate cycle than Alain, so that our author keeps Pelles as *roi pescheor*, and, despite his mystic title, as a king of the ordinary kind who guards the castle and the people in it. It was natural that he should do this, for this was, on the whole, Pelles' character in the prose *Lancelot*, and even in the *Queste*. On the other hand, he follows the general tendency of the later Arthurian romances to give a definite name to hitherto unnamed characters. Among innumerable examples of this tendency compare Galahad's mother, who, despite Sommer's side notes and the index to his edition of the Vulgate

cycle, is unnamed in that cycle, but is called Elaine in Malory.[1] So, too, the Maid of Ascalot first receives the specific name, Elaine, in Malory. In compliance with this tendency the Maimed King is given the name Pellinor, which is formed on the name of Pelles.[2]

Now, although our author takes Pelles as the Fisher King, he keeps Alain as a second Maimed King—doubtless, under the influence of Chrétien, in whose *Perceval*, as we have seen, there were really two Maimed Kings. Besides, the author of this *Merlin* continuation would be little disposed to drop any member of the Grail family, for it was his policy to crowd into his pages every Arthurian character of any prominence, as is evident from the enormous number of names which this branch of the cycle contains. And in addition to these considerations, he would have the powerful motive of establishing a trinity of Grail Kings to parallel that of the Christian Godhead. When Pellinor is provided with such an abundance of sons, this is in imitation of Bron, the first Fisher King in de Borron's *Joseph*[3] and in the *Estoire del Saint Graal*.[4]

Finally, the author harmonizes the reconstituted Grail family by making Pelles, Pellinor, and Alain, brothers.[5]

[1] Brugger, *Zeitschr. für franz. Sprache und Litt.*, XL², 46, n. 10, offers an erroneous explanation of how the daughter of Pelles came to be called Helaine (Elaine). The true explanation is simple. In the passage of the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation, which compares Guinevere with Pelles' daughter and Helaine sans per and which I have just quoted according to the reading of MS 747, a scribe dropped out by mistake the *et* (or its symbol) which connected the names of the two heroines. In consequence of this error, we find the two already confounded in the Middle English version of the Vulgate *Merlin*. Cf. H. B. Wheatley's edition for the Early English Text Society (1865), Part I, p. 229.

[2] Brugger, *op. cit.*, p. 48, n. 11, has already suggested that the name Pellinor was arbitrarily fabricated in dependence on the name Pelles. Was the name of Virgil's pilot, Palinurus, in the author's mind? In such cases the mediaeval romancers regarded a general resemblance as sufficient. Cf. my discussion of the name, "Galahad," in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXXIII (1918), 129 ff.

[3] Cf. G. Weidner's edition (Oppeln, 1881), p. 123. Bron had twelve sons.

[4] Sommer's *Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, I, 249. It was, no doubt, the example of Bron in the *Joseph*, that led the author of the *Perlesvaus* to make his Grail Knight, Perceval, one of twelve sons. It is true that he makes Bron's son, Alain (li Gros), father of the twelve sons, but in such shiftings the writers of Arthurian romance exercise complete freedom.

[5] Alain occurs only once as Pelles' brother in the Vulgate cycle outside of the *Merlin* continuation, viz., in the *Lancelot*, III, 117. But the passage, since it contains allusions to the *Queste* and *Estoire*, could not have belonged originally to the *Lancelot*. It is an interpolation—taken, indeed, from the passage of the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation, II, 159, which I have quoted above from MS 747. To be sure, Sommer, *Modern Philology*, V, 305, and Brugger, *op. cit.*, p. 49, n. 11, are inclined to believe that the reverse is true. Sommer has, still further, injudiciously adopted in the *Queste*, VI, 102, the reading *Alain* instead of the true reading *Herlan* (son of Pierre, Alain's brother), which latter is found in

Pellinor, who was thus invented, as I maintain, by the author of the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation, is found also in the *Merlin* continuation of the pseudo-Robert de Borron cycle, which is best represented by the Huth MS. There he is Perceval's father.[1] It is not likely, however, that the author of this new *Merlin* continuation derived the character directly from the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation. G. Paris has asserted[2] that the Huth *Merlin* is entirely independent of the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation and that the authors of these continuations executed them "sans se connaître."[3] Perhaps, however, this last phrase is too strong. The author of the Huth *Merlin* may have ignored his predecessor's work, first, because the two authors, as Paris himself observes, pursued different aims, the author of the Vulgate version fashioning in his work an introduction to the *Lancelot*, the author of the Huth *Merlin* endeavoring to connect the *Merlin* of de Borron with the *Queste*. Second, because of the difference in the tendencies of the authors, which is about as great as could well be imagined. The Vulgate version is, for the most part, a pseudo-historical record of endless wars, in the style of the chronicles; the Huth *Merlin*, as befitted a work which belongs to the later development of Arthurian romance, is composed of romantic fictions of the most extravagant kind. The author of the latter was certainly familiar with all the other members of the Vulgate cycle—so how can we suppose him ignorant of the branch in which he would naturally be most interested, especially when that branch was one of the most widely diffused works of the Middle Ages? At any rate, Brugger's contention[4] that, if the one author had known of the other's work, he would probably not have composed a new continuation is not

MSS M and R, and (with corrupt spellings) in still others that he cites. Nowhere else in the Arthurian romances is Alain given a son, *Argustes*, whereas we have in the *Estoire del Saint Graal*, I, 280, *Agristes* named as a descendant of Herlan.

[1] The passages bearing on this subject are I, 150, 160, 258, 260 f. We have here the same trick as in the description of Pelles in the *Lancelot* and *Queste:* one has to assemble these passages to make out clearly that Pellinor is Perceval's father. In the Spanish version of the *Merlin* continuation of this cycle Pellinor is also found. Cf. Bonilla's edition of the *Demanda*, pp. 124, 126, 137–44. He does not appear in the *Demanda* proper (i.e., the Quest section).

[2] Introduction to the Huth *Merlin*, p. lxiv.

[3] So, too, Wechssler's above-quoted treatise, p. 5, and Brugger, *Zeitschr. für franz. Sprache und Litt.*, XXIX, 109.

[4] See passage cited in preceding note. I hope to show in a future article that the influence of the Vulgate *Merlin* is, after all, discernible in the Huth *Merlin*.

sustained by what we know of the methods of the Arthurian romancers; for, as a matter of fact, a new Mort Arthur section was composed for the pseudo-Robert de Borron cycle, although the writer knew the Vulgate version well and used it largely, and, what is perhaps even more to the point, the author of the *Merlin* continuation of MS 337 composed his own work, though he was familiar with the corresponding Vulgate version, as Brugger himself has observed.[1] It seems to me most probable that the author of the Huth *Merlin* was incited to write his branch of the new cycle by the Vulgate version, the author of which also ascribed his work to Robert de Borron, but for the reasons recited, gave his narrative an altogether different turn.

To come back, however, to the question of Pellinor in the Huth *Merlin*, the character was derived, no doubt, by the author of that romance from the prose *Tristan*. The influence of the latter romance, as Wechssler (p. 5) has set forth, is the distinguishing mark of this cycle, as compared with the Vulgate, and we have, I believe, in the matter now before us, one of the manifestations of this influence. In the prose *Tristan*, too, Pellinor was Perceval's father, and it was no doubt the author of this romance who originally conferred on him that honor.[2] The author of the *Tristan* took this particular name from the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation and gave it to Perceval's father, most likely because Pellinor was there connected with the Grail as a Grail King, just as Perceval was the Grail Knight in other romances. The Grail attributes of Pellinor, however, if we may judge by Löseth's analysis, are effaced in the brief passages concerning him in the *Tristan*, which mainly relate to his death, and this, no doubt, is the reason why the same thing is true of the character in the Huth *Merlin*. The connection of the main passage in the prose *Tristan* about Pellinor (Löseth, p. 234) with the Huth *Merlin*, I, 261, is too obvious for dispute. In both we have Gawain figuring as the slayer of Pellinor (who had slain Gawain's father) and the enemy of his sons. Under these circumstances, to explain Pellinor's

[1] *Zeitschr. für franz. Sprache und Litt.*, XXVIII (1905), 57.

[2] The writers of the Arthurian romances were not bound by tradition in naming the fathers of their heroes. In the extant romances six different names (not reckoning scribal variants) are given to Perceval's father. See Miss J. L. Weston's *Legend of Sir Perceval* (London, 1906), I, 60 ff.

part in the Huth *Merlin*, there is no need of resorting to the theory of lost cycles.

Pellinor appears again in the *Merlin* continuation of MS 337. Indeed, the peculiarity of this work is that it contains not merely one Pellinor but two. The one is the original Pellinor (as we may call him) of the Vulgate, the brother of Pelles; but there is an additional Pellinor, *not* a brother of Pelles, who, it is true, assumes the attributes of the original Pellinor, including his multitude of sons. Sommer has erroneously asserted[1] that it is the first and original Pellinor, the brother of Pelles and Alain, whom the author of this *Merlin* continuation makes the father of Perceval. But it is the second Pellinor, the *cousin* of Pelles and Alain, who is here Perceval's father. This is perfectly clear from the passages that relate to this subject in the text. Perceval's father in these passages is both *roi pescheor* and *roi mahaignie*. The following account is given, VII, 243, of the circumstances under which he became maimed:

Il auint un soir que li rois Pellinor li peres Perceual se gisoit en son lit & pensa molt durement a merueilles que il auoit oi retraire paroles du Saint Graal & tant qui(l) les comenca a mescroire. & endementres que il saloit desesperant si uint une lance toute ardant deuers le ciel toute en flambe bruiant come foudre si le feri si durement parmi outre les cuisses ambedeus tres parmi sa robe dom il estoit couerz que tout cousi luj & son lit a la terre dure & lors li dist une uoiz au resachier hors quele fist de la lance. cest li uengemenz de ce que tu as mes oeures mescreues & moi deshonore par ta pensee fole & mauuese & por ce que tu es cil que iauoie tant essaucie de lignage sor toz autres lignages & que ge tauoie baillie en garde mon sanc & ma char & tu ten desesperoies por ce le te ferai ge si comparer que toz les iors que tu uiuras ten memberra & le ior que tu garras rendras lame du cors. tu soloies auoir non li rois de la Gaste Forest Soutaine or auras non li rois peschierres car petit auras de sante se lors non que tu seras en riuiere. & le ior que Pellinor tes cosins gara tu garras & morras. & par ce que tu as mescreu mes miracles que ge demonstroie par cest pais por ce sera tes filz Perceual reusez dauoir le Graal en sa garde iusque apres la mort au fill de la fille le roi Pelles car se tes pechiez ne fust de ce que mescreu as tes filz leust auant en garde.

In consequence of his wounds, if he wished to divert himself or go anywhere, like Chrétien's *roi pescheor* (*Perceval*, pp. 3470 ff.), he resorted to a boat. In the paragraph just before this the companions of Agloval (Perceval's brother) lament with him over the

[1] *Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, VII, 146, n. 1; 243, n. 1.

slaying of his brothers and after expressing their compassion for his mother add:

de uostre pere ne di ge mie, fait chascuns, car toz ses deporz sunt en soi faire nagier parmi ces riuieres granz & parfondez por oblier ses plaies & sa dolor entre luj & le roi Alain son cosin & le roi Pelles du chastel de Corbenic.

Compare, too, VII, 244, where Perceval's father, hearing of the death of his fourteen sons,

ne uost onques puis estre en son recet einz sen ala seiorner u Chastel de la Merueille auec la mere au roi Artus que Merlins i auoit portee mes nu sauoient nules genz fors cil qui le Saintisme Graal auoient en garde. & aloit souent naiant en une nef enuiron le chastel par la riuiere qui grant estoit (&) qui duroit iusquau chastel de Corbenic & iusquau chastel au roi Alain ilec ou il manoit. & saloient dedui(s)ant par leue de chastel en chastel por ce que mahaignie estoient par lor pechie de la lance meismes dom Ioseph d'Abaramathie fu nauurez en la hanche a la cite d' Orberique ilec ou il laissa la gent paienne a baptizier por rescorre la gent a lenemi qui les aloit ociant defors la cite.

These passages agree perfectly—in part, even in phrasing—with the description which is given of the second Pellinor, the cousin of Pelles and Alain, in this text. Cf. VII, 146, which runs as follows:

Apres ce que Gale(h)ot ot les viij. princes conquis si entra u roiaume au roi Alain le frere au roi Pellinor & le frere au roi Pelles du chastel de Corbenic qui cosin germain estoient au roi Pellinor le roi mahaignie de la cuisse de la lance ue(n)cheresse que li contes apele le riche roi pescheor por ce quil ne pooit nule foiz cheuauchier ainz le couenoit toz iors mener en nef quant il remuoit de leu en autre por le saint seruise oir que li sainz esperiz i faisoit chascun ior de la soe saintisme boche & donoit son sacrement a touz cels qui a la table seoient & asouisoit cuer dome & pensee plus que il ne seust penser tant com il fust a cele table. ne ne seoient a cele table a ce tans de lors nule foiz fors solement li rois Pellinor qui fu peres Perceual qui encores nauoit que demi an & li rois Alains qui estoit ausinc naurez de la lance desferree & Pellinor (qui) fu naurez a tout le fer. & li rois qui nule foiz ne leuoit dont li contes a molt parle u comencement Mordrains li rois de Sarraz qui ne uiuoit mais solement de loiste sacree que li angle le metoit chascun ior en la bouche & ne uiuoit dautre chose.[1]

The distinction between the first Pellinor and the second is maintained, besides, in VII, 237, from which we learn, furthermore,

[1] There is a similar description of Perceval's father, but very brief, in VII, 236.

that the first Pellinor was Perceval's uncle (his mother's brother), as the second Pellinor was his father. The passage reads:

> Agloual [Perceval's brother] demanda se ses peres estoit nes point asoagie & la mere dist. biaus filz coment asoagera il. ia ne se demostrent mie encore les auentures du graal par quoi il doit garison auoir. & uostre freres roi Pel(l)inor du chastel de Corbenic coment le fait il. & el(e) li dist si com ele seust.

There is accordingly no contradiction whatever in this romance, as Sommer imagines,[1] when Alain is called cousin of Perceval's father.

The explanation of the two Pellinors in this *Merlin* continuation of MS 337 is that the writer has adopted the Pellinors, respectively, of both the Vulgate *Merlin* and prose *Tristan* and given each of them a place in connection with the Grail. The Pellinor of the *Tristan*, Perceval's father and a secular figure, assumes, however, in our text as I have already remarked, the attributes of his namesake, the Grail King of the Vulgate, and himself becomes a Grail King. Like the Vulgate Pellinor, he had been wounded by the avenging lance and had a multitude of sons. On the other hand, under the influence of Chrétien's *Perceval* (ll. 6377 ff.) our author makes Perceval a nephew, through his mother, of the three Grail Kings that were taken over from the Vulgate *Merlin* continuation, just as in that poem he had been, through his mother, a nephew of the mysterious Grail King, father of the *roi pescheor*. He becomes here, accordingly, a maternal nephew of the Vulgate Pellinor. The retention of the two Pellinors is due to the author's desire to sweep into his net as many Grail Kings as possible. In the above-quoted passage we see him including in the company of the Grail table even Mordrain, who had never been definitely identified with either Fisher King or Maimed King, although in the *Estoire del Saint Graal*, I, 241, and in the *Queste*, VI, 62 ff., he had suffered much the same fate as the Maimed King.[2]

[1] VII, 243, n. 1.

[2] E. Freymond, *Zeitschr. für roman. Phil.*, XVI, 106, is greatly puzzled by the Pellinors of this romance, but he does not seem to me to have brought any light into the matter. In the *Zeitschr. für franz. Sprache und Litt.*, XVII, 100, n. 2, he recognizes, however, that MS 337 is here in agreement with the Huth *Merlin*, Portuguese *Demanda*, and prose *Tristan*, as to Pellinor's being the name of Perceval's father.

We face here, it is true, the difficulty that the author of the *Merlin* continuation of MS 337 does not in other points, as far as I am aware, show dependence on the prose *Tristan*. But in the *Tristan*, a work of universal fame in the Middle Ages, Pellinor is the name of Perceval's father, and, in view of this fact, there seems no need of resorting to hypothetical sources for this conception in the comparatively late text now under consideration. The author might not have any intimate acquaintance with that romance and yet derive from it, indirectly, perhaps, the conception that Perceval's father was so named.

Pellinor does not appear in either the Didot *Perceval* or the *Perlesvaus*.

III. *Pellean* (*Pelleam, Pellehan, Pellehem*).

This name—it is impossible to say with certainty which variant is the original one—does not occur at all in the *Merlin* continuation of MS 337, and in the whole Vulgate cycle it occurs only twice, viz., in the *Queste*, VI, 144, though not in all MSS, and in the *Estoire del Saint Graal*, I, 290. To what extent it is found in the MSS of the latter passage we are unable to say, since collations of the MSS of the *Estoire* are wanting. In any event, considering the close relations of *Queste* and *Estoire*, the name, no doubt, passed directly from the manuscripts of the one romance into those of the other, and so, in all likelihood, we are really not confronted here with two different sources of independent value.

Take first the *Queste* passage. Most of the MSS, Sommer tells us (*ibid.*, n. 9) make Perceval's sister say to him at this point: "ie sui uostre seur & fille al roi Pellehem [or Pellean and other variant spellings]."

Inasmuch as Sommer names only five of the MSS which have the name Pellehem or Pellean in this place, we cannot determine whether the weight of manuscript authority, reckoning not merely by numbers, supports this as the true reading. M, which is, generally speaking, the best MS for the latter part of the Vulgate cycle, has here merely: "ie sui uostre seur," and "others, e.g., No. 343, *Bibl. Nat.*, and No. 4377 Phillip's (*sic*) collection, agree with M," as Sommer himself says. Perhaps M is right in the present passage, as it

certainly is in the *Mort Artu*, where, as against the overwhelming majority of MSS, it makes Morgan le Fay the chief lady of the ship which bears the wounded Arthur away to Avalon: see the record of the MS readings in my edition of the *Mort Artu* (p. 250, n. 2). In any case, no importance can be attached to this name, which occurs here alone (and not in all MSS) in the whole range of Arthurian romance as that of Perceval's father. Whether the scribe who was in the first instance responsible for the name in the present passage took it from the *Estoire*, I, 290, or as I believe, vice versa, it is, in any event and in all probability, simply the distortion of some one of the names of Perceval's father which we find in the other romances —most likely of Pellinor, who in the Huth *Merlin*, Portuguese *Demanda*, *Merlin* continuation of MS 337, and prose *Tristan* is that hero's father. It is to be noted that each is king of Listenois. For Pellinor cf. Vulgate *Merlin* (II, 346, 374), *Tristan* (pp. 38, 155, etc.), for Pellean cf. Huth *Merlin* (II, 30) and Spanish *Demanda* (pp. 107, 111). *Pellean* for *Pellinor* (the Portuguese *Demanda* in the corresponding passage actually has *Pellinor*) is a mild corruption for a mediaeval scribe, as unnumbered examples in the MSS of the Arthurian romances themselves—to go no further—sufficiently prove.[1] In MS A at this point we have not *Pellean* (*Pelleam*) or *Pellehem*, but merely *Pelle;* and the name Pellinor was easily subject to corruption, if the *-or* were written above the line, as is often the case in mediaeval MSS, and in an illegible hand. In the *Perlesvaus* MSS the name of Perceval's father (*nota bene!*), which was *Alain*, becomes distorted to *Julien*, *Julain*, *Vilain*.[2] The *Brulans* of the *Estoire*, I, 290, becomes *Urlains* in *Queste*, VI, 147. New characters occasionally come into existence in such instances through the failure of subsequent writers to recognize that the new names are merely manuscript corruptions of old ones. The best-known instance in the Arthurian romances is in the case of Gawain's brothers, Gaheries and Guerrehes. One of these names is merely a manuscript

[1] The fact is too well known to require illustration. Cf., for example, the variants in Sommer's Index or in E. Langlois' *Table des noms propres de toute nature compris dans les chansons de geste* (Paris, 1904), or in such an edition as that of the *Roman de Troie* by L. Constans (Paris, 1904–12) where all variants are recorded from the numerous MSS.

[2] Cf. W. A. Nitze's *Perlesvaus* dissertation, p. 110.

variation of the other.[1] They came to be accepted, however, as the names of separate characters, and, as such, run all through Arthurian romance. The Huth MS of Robert's *Merlin*, I, 120, somewhat in the same fashion and doubtless through a misunderstanding, makes two sisters out of Morgan le Fay, accepting for one the nominative form of her name, *Morgue(s)*, for the other the objective form, *Morgan(=Morgain)*. In *Escanor* (ll. 14365, 14389, 18857 ff.) new characters are created out of variants of Perceval's name (Percevaus, Pellesvaus). In consequence of MS corruptions of the name "Helins li Blons" (including the epithet), the scribes of the prose *Lancelot* have called into existence three brothers of the same name, only distinguished by varying corruptions of the original epithet; cf. Sommer's index under "Helys li Blois." The *Brulans* of the *Estoire*, mentioned above, yields in the same way *Garlans* in the Huth *Merlin*, II, 21 ff., who there plays a more extended rôle than Brulans did in the *Estoire*, although the connection with the dolorous stroke incident and the similarity to the corrupt variant, *Varlans*, recorded by Sommer (Index), prove that the two characters are certainly identical. Nearest of all to the corruption which I suppose in the case of Pellean's name are the variants for the name of the Grail Castle in Malory's *Morte Darthur*. In the *Queste* section of his work (e.g., pp. 644, 690, 717, in Sommer's edition) this name always appears as *Carbone(c)k*, in the *Lancelot* section (e.g., pp. 575, 580, 603), as *Corbyn*. The difference was probably already in Malory's French MSS. The loss of the last syllable here is just the same as I postulate in the case of *Pellean*.

Having finished with *Queste*, VI, 144, let us turn now to the passage in the *Estoire del Saint Graal*, I, 290. The passage in the MS which Sommer reproduces reads as follows:

Apres le roy lambor [i.e., the descendant of Bron whom the pagan king, Brulans, had slain with King David's sword] regna li rois pelleam son fil,

[1] On this subject see Miss J. L. Weston, *Legend of Sir Perceval*, I, 247, n. 2, and E. Brugger, *Zeitschr. für franz. Sprache und Litt.*, XXXI (1907), 144 ff. In the H. Morf *Festschrift* (Halle, 1905), p. 83, the latter remarks on this phenomenon, but his examples are not very satisfactory.

A good example, outside of the Arthurian romances, is the creation by manuscript alteration of a new divinity, *Demogorgon*, out of *demiourgon* (Plato's demiurge) in the commentary on Statius (*Thebais*, IV, 516) by Lactantius Placidus; cf. G. Knaack, *Zeitschr. für vergleich. Literaturgeschichte, Neue Folge*, XII, 22 ff. From Boccaccio to Shelley this spurious divinity has cut no insignificant figure in literature. Not one of Shelley's editors has recognized the true origin of the character.

qui fu mahaig(nie) de .ij. cuisses en vne bataille de rome & pour le mah(a)ig quil rechut en cele bataille lapelerent tuit cil qui le connurent le roy mahaignie por ce quil ne pot garir de la plaie deuant ce que galaad le tres bon cheualier le uendra uisiter. Mais lors sans faille sera il garis. Et de celui descendoit vns rois qui ot a non pelles, biaus cheualiers & preus durement.

The passage goes on to say that Galahad, son of Pelles' daughter, brought to an end the adventures of the Holy Grail. On the other hand, in the MS followed by Hucher, *Le Saint Graal*, III, 295, the passage reads:

Apries le roy Lambor regna Pellehans et ses fieus qui fu mahaignies, etc.

Probably, however, Sommer's text is correct, and the *et* (or its symbol) after *Pellehans* in Hucher's MS was an unwarranted insertion. Similarly, in the *Queste*, VI, 185, MS R (cf. Sommer, n. 11), by the insertion of "&," makes two persons out of the elder Galahad, king of Hozelice.

Now the *Estoire*, as Arthurian scholars (except Heinzel, pp. 129 f.) are pretty generally agreed, is later than the *Queste*, although in the extant MSS they have been reciprocally adjusted to each other. Its author, then, doubtless derived this name from some MS of the *Queste* that had the reading *Pellean* (*Pellehan*) in the present passage. It is to be observed, however, that in the *Estoire* the name is given not to the father of Perceval, but to the father of Pelles—identified here with the (generally) unnamed *roi mahaignie*. With this discrepancy, it does no good to assume a lost common source. We are confronted simply with one of the arbitrary namings (or shiftings of relationship) of subordinate characters of the Grail cycle[1] which we meet with everywhere in the Grail romances. Either the author of the *Estoire*, as suggested above, or a scribe—in the absence of MS collations, we cannot say which—applied the name of a king connected in a *Queste* MS with the Grail circle to another king connected with the Grail circle. He may have done it deliberately or he may have done it through a confusion of memory. Either is possible.

It should be repeated that nowhere except in the *Queste* passage discussed above does Pellean appear again as Perceval's father.

[1] We have seen, for instance, that Perceval's father bears six different names in as many romances. Galahad's mother is called in *Lancelot*, III, 29, Amite (with variant spellings) or Helizabel—in the English *Merlin* and Malory, Elaine. And so on.

The character, who, as I have maintained, owes his existence to a scribal blunder, passed into the pseudo-Robert cycle (Huth *Merlin*,[1] Spanish *Demanda*[2])—probably from the above-quoted passage of the *Estoire*, I, 290—but he is not Perceval's father in that cycle and he plays there an insignificant rôle, which surely does not comport with the supposition that he had ever been accepted seriously as Perceval's father.

The name does not occur in the Didot *Perceval* or in the *Perlesvaus*, and in the prose *Tristan* we find it merely as an unauthorized MS variant for *Pelles* in one passage (Löseth, p. 250).[3]

J. Douglas Bruce

University of Tennessee

[1] II, 7, 21–28. The Huth MS is, unfortunately, defective in this episode (pp. 21–28), the only one in which Pellean appears as an actor. Paris, *ibid.*, II, 27, n. 1, summarizes the corresponding passage in Malory.

[2] Bonilla's edition, pp. 107–11.

[3] Before leaving the subject, I should say that Sommer has proposed in *Romania*, XXXVI (1907), 552, an etymology for *Pellehem*, *Pellean*, etc., viz., *Pel-alein* or *Pel-helain*, which would be a combination of *Pelles* and *Alain*.

Nitze, in his well-known article, "The Fisher King in the Grail Romances," *PMLA*, XXIV (1909), 379, n. 2, appears to have arrived at the same etymology independently. Owing, however, to the conditions which I have analyzed above, the explanation which I have offered seems to me preferable.

After the first section of this article had passed through the press, I observed that A. N. Wesselofsky, *Archiv für Slavische Philologie*, XXIII (1901), 374 f., had already proposed to derive *Pelles* from *Peleus* (*Pelleus*), but on grounds which I cannot accept. He makes the impossible identification of Pelles with Pellean, who, as we have seen, suffered the dolorous stroke, and then identifies the spear of this stroke with the spear which, according to the classical legend, the centaur Cheiron gave to Peleus and which is commonly known as the spear of Achilles (son of Peleus). This spear had the power of healing the wound which it inflicted.

STUDIES IN BALZAC

II. CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF REALISM[1]

I. DEFINITION

The terms "realism and naturalism" have been bandied about until, like worn coins, their value is scarcely discernible. To add to the confusion, there is some authority for using the two words interchangeably. But for present purposes it is best to discriminate and define, and on the whole French and English critics leave one with the conviction that it is justifiable to make between realism and naturalism a distinction both of time and of degree. Chronologically, in nineteenth-century fiction, the best work of Balzac and of Flaubert stands for the earlier development of realism; while Zola and his school pushed that doctrine to its farthest extreme and baptized it *le Naturalisme*. To support the distinction, I may recall that M. Lanson does not include Balzac under his treatment of naturalism, which is happily defined by Mr. Wright[2] as an "acute form" of realism.

Then what is realism? Can we still say, as Littré did in the eighties, that it is an "attachement à la reproduction de la nature sans idéal"?[3] But today we think of the "nature sans idéal" as rather the fetish of the naturalists. It is true that certain French critics, including Brunetière, use *réaliste* and *naturaliste* as practically synonomous. Else it would be difficult for Brunetière to maintain (for all his fulminations against the latter-day school) that "les romans de Balzac ne sont des *romans* que dans la mesure où ils sont naturalistes"; that Balzac was a naturalist in all senses of the word and that his excellence is to be judged by the degree to which he

[1] The first study in this series appeared in *Modern Philology*, XIII (1915), pp. 193–213, under the title of "Balzac and Cooper: *Les Chouans*." The present article attempts a synthesis of the various critical views of French realism, with the object of disengaging its qualities and factors as revealed in the *Comédie humaine*. The third study will deal with Balzac's method in general, and the fourth with the realistic method of one particular work.

[2] C. H. C. Wright, *History of French Literature*, p. 757.

[3] Littré, *s.v.*

followed that doctrine.[1] Evidently Brunetière uses what he calls "le vrai naturalisme" as equivalent to our "realism," and it is in this sense that he defines the adjective, "naturalistes, c'est-à-dire . . . conformes à la réalité de la vie."[2] It is also in this sense that he quotes a seventeenth-century definition: "L'opinion qu'on appelle *naturaliste* . . . est celle qui estime nécessaire l'exacte imitation de la nature en toutes choses."

Call it which you please, we have in this passage a classic war-cry extended to the concreter realism, though the word "nature" still remains vague. That subject-matter is better delimited by Duranty, who probably gave points to Zola, in his journal entitled *le Réalisme*. He defines this term as "la reproduction exacte, complète, sincère, du milieu social, de l'époque où l'on vit."[3] Thus in 1857—the date of *Madame Bovary*—the main articles of the creed were already posited as these four: exactness, completeness or universality of representation, truth, and the socio-historical approach.

The distinctions, from Brunetière's austere standpoint, between realism and naturalism are well stated in the *Avertissement* to *Le Roman naturaliste*.[4] Brunetière says he wrote this book in order to "opposer les conditions d'un art vraiment naturaliste, qui sont: la probité de l'observation, la sympathie pour la souffrance, l'indulgence aux humbles, et la simplicité de l'exécution, aux caractères les plus généraux du naturalisme contemporain, lesquels sont au contraire la superstition de l'écriture 'artiste,' le pessimisme littéraire, et la recherche de la grossièreté."

Omitting the more exotic elements of the first formula, and bearing in mind especially the practice of Balzac and Flaubert, we may now arrive at a working definition of realism: It is the art of representing actuality, viewed largely from the material standpoint, in a way to produce as closely as possible the impression of truth.

[1] Brunetière, *Honoré de Balzac*, pp. 134–35.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 136.

[3] Quoted by Wright, p. 760.

[4] Pp. ii–iii. Cf. Sainte-Beuve's famous diatribe, in *Nouveaux lundis*, IV, 137–38, where the critic, admitting reality to be the "fond de la vie," yet protests against mere photography and flatness and insists upon the adjuncts of style, sentiment, and idealism. In connection with *Madame Bovary*, Sainte-Beuve defined the qualities of the new realism as "science, esprit d'observation, maturité, force, un peu de dureté," *Causeries du lundi*, XIII, 363.

As for naturalism, it is virtually a *reductio ad absurdum* of the foregoing. The daring doctrine of Zola and Huysmans that Balzac was the master, whose method should be broadened by that of Stendhal to cover the psychological field, has really landed them in a field of quite another character. And their desire to exhibit "la vérité toute nue" has justified such epigrams as that of Saintsbury: "The ambition of the Naturalists was to mention the unmentionable with as much fulness of detail as possible."[1] Balzac may have instituted the exploitation of *la bête humaine*, but the naturalist who made the phrase famous was obsessed by its half-truth; the naturalist, says Meredith, "sees only the hog in nature and then takes nature for the hog."

II. GENERAL QUALITIES

In trying to establish a definition of realism, I have been led to anticipate its more usual qualities. Including those already given, as well as other more debatable characteristics, I submit the following list of features ascribable to various brands of realistic fiction. Reserving until later questions relative to technique and *procédés*, here are the main possibilities that realism presents in the realm of ideas:

Truth, or correspondence with objective reality
Materialism: Animalism, money, externality
Impersonality
The scientific viewpoint
The claim to universality
The documentary method, or technical erudition
Tediousness
Representation of mediocrity and triviality
Solidity
Sympathy with ordinary life
Sociological features

Let us take these in order. The question of truth, as applied to any given picture of life, is usually the most difficult to decide. If a critic asks himself, Does this correspond to life as I know it?, the answer will frequently be, No. But one should proceed to a

[1] *History of French Literature*, p. 564.

further question, Does this correspond to life as I can readily conceive of it? Is it *vraisemblable*, if not absolutely *vrai?* And is the representation self-consistent? Then the answer, drawn from a good realist, is usually, Yes. In other words, the truth in Balzac may sometimes be a matter of simply reporting facts, but more frequently it will be a matter of transmuting and raising facts to the value of coherent and plausible symbols.

The critics are almost unanimous in praising Balzac's knowledge of reality and his power of conveying it in transmuted terms. "This is where Balzac remains unshaken," says Henry James, "—in our feeling that with all his faults . . . . , his spirit has somehow paid for its knowledge." And he compares the French novelist to Shakespeare for his "charged consciousness of truth and his direct exposure of sensibility."[1]

Brunetière, in the *Roman naturaliste*, disconcerts us a little by declaring that "Balzac, à proprement parler, n'est pas un réaliste." But why not? Because he transforms reality, because he does not make a servile copy—like the naturalists, as we would say. Brunetière is again juggling with our terms, but his opinion of Balzac stands out clearly enough: "Il met dans les caractères une logique, et dans les développements de la passion une suite"—which they do not have in real life.[2] Does that impair the artistic verity of monomaniacs like the Baron Hulot or Old Grandet, who say and do almost nothing that is not related to their master-passion? Brunetière, at least, does not think so. "Ils sont donc *vrais* . . . et ils sont vrais précisément en tant qu'ils cessent d'être *réels.*"[3] Elsewhere this critic declares that no one has the faculty of arriving at truth like Balzac and that in spite of his romantic side-shows, his grandiose characters and his crude mysticism, the *Comédie humaine* is largely a rehabilitation of "l'humble vérité."[4]

Similarly Saintsbury marvels at the novelist's "power of conferring apparent reality upon what the reader nevertheless feels to be imaginary and ideal. Everything is seen through a kind of distorting lens, yet the actual vision is defined with the most extraordinary

[1] H. James, *The Question of Our Speech; the Lesson of Balzac*, p. 94.
[2] *Roman naturaliste*, p. 5.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 35.
[4] *Honoré de Balzac*, pp. 127, 133.

precision and in the most vivid colors."[1] By the "actual vision," I suppose Saintsbury means the detailed presentment of each particular scene. If so, he agrees with Balzac's own dictum in the celebrated *Avant-propos de la Comédie humaine:* the law of the novel is to "tendre vers le beau idéal. . . . Mais le roman ne serait rien si, dans cet auguste mensonge, il n'était pas vrai dans les détails."[2] And elsewhere Balzac significantly reproves those vague idealists, like George Sand, who "courent dans le vide."

Balzac then told the truth—granted. But did he tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth? The phrases about the *auguste mensonge* and the "distorting lens" would make us doubt it, if we did not doubt it already. In that process of transmuting and solidifying reality, did he not mix some strange elements in the alembic? Romantic and melodramatic exaggeration of character and incident certainly play a large part in his novels. It seems clear also that, like Zola and the Goncourts, Balzac dwelt willingly on the exceptional and even the pathological. Leslie Stephen declares that no such world as Balzac's was possible, because no such world could have continued to exist.[3] But due allowance must of course be made for the romancer's right to choose the extraordinary, even the criminally interesting.

It scarcely seems likely that Balzac laid equal emphasis on all sides of truth. Fromentin is quoted as saying of the naturalists: "Ils avaient l'air de révolutionnaires, parce qu'ils n'affectaient d'admettre que la moitié des vérités nécessaires."[4] And Balzac himself laments that, since he painted things as they are, it has been foolishly said "que j'appartenais à l'école sensualiste et matérialiste."[5]

On the whole, his work does produce a materialistic effect. There is no denying it, and his own denials, it has been pointed out, are perfunctory.[6] He was as frank a Rabelaisian as any, he believed in force, food, money, and things, and the real issue is to discover to

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 511.

[2] *Œuvres* (M. Lévy edition), I, 10.

[3] *Hours in a Library*, I, 312. Yet Stephen admits Balzac's "intense realization of actors and scenery" and his "patient Dutch" artistry (pp. 271, 278).

[4] Quoted by Brunetière, *Rom. nat.*, p. 49.

[5] *Œuvres*, I, 11.

[6] Pellissier, *Le mouvement littéraire au dix-neuvieme siècle*, p. 250.

what fictional values his materialism led him. Here one may consider Brunetière's onslaught against materialistic, especially naturalistic fiction: "C'est un art qui sacrifie la forme à la matière, le dessein à la couleur, le sentiment à la sensation, l'idéal au réel; qui ne recule ni devant la trivialité, la brutalité même, qui parle enfin son langage à la foule."[1] Among the questions that will repay investigation are these: does Balzac sacrifice form to matter, and if so, what is the effect on his style? Does he pile on sensations, colors, coarseness of language and treatment? Is he, like Zola, constantly comparing human beings to animals, according to the theory of the *Avant-propos*?[2] Or has he affinities with Stendhal, materializing psychology in terms of "la sensation, la physiologie, le fatalisme du tempérament?"[3]

It is evident that Balzac's materialism will affect the method and quantity of his description. Both Brunetière and Taine give a certain progression, the first logical, the second both logical and to some extent actual in its application to the novelist's method. Balzac, says the former, introduced the treatment of these chief material preoccupations: living, which depends upon eating, which depends upon money, which depends upon work, which depends upon a trade or profession. Then and thus would come the handling of "la diversité des conditions, chacune caractérisée par les traits qui lui sont propres," manifest in descriptions as well as in technically suitable dialogues and the very manipulations of the plot.[4]

The space given to money and to business affairs is among the most salient features of Balzac's work. His own business ventures gave him a knowledge in this field which he used better for imaginary people than for his own prosperity. He insists always on the importance of incomes and investments. Does he make these, e.g., in *Eugénie Grandet*, correspond to the knowledge and nature of the particular character? Such novels as *Le Cousin Pons* and *César Birotteau* require, in their different ways, very careful following of the financial moves. Even the careless young men of the Pension

[1] *Rom. nat.*, p. 3.

[2] The use of this analogy, which may be called animalism, will be more fully treated in the third study of this series.

[3] Pellissier, p. 245.

[4] *Rom. nat.*, pp. 63–64. For Taine's analysis of this, see subsequent study.

Vauquer, as Gautier points out, do not live poetically in the "mansardes de convention" and eat "des mets simples apprêtés par la main de la nature."[1] They are figured out much closer than that. Brunetière thinks Taine stresses too admiringly Balzac's preoccupation with the money basis. Not even a "naturalistic" novel should repose entirely on this foundation and money probably occupies less place in life than Balzac thought—"et pour cause."[2]

To pass to the next quality, does all this materialism of treatment mean that Balzac's world is mainly external, that he lacks psychological and spiritual insight? The consensus of opinion is that he lacks the second but not usually the first. Then how are his "souls" made up, if he shows us mainly the environment of body? What is his recipe for fusing a character out of a soul apparently considered at best only as a collection of qualities and sentiments? I do not know that one can answer such a question, for it may be that here we touch the secret of genius, the power of divination that Balzac accorded himself and that others have accorded him. But perhaps we can trace some of the ways in which Balzac at his best avoids the reproach of threatening externality. Brunetière suggests one way when he says that such books as *Eugénie Grandet* are not fortuitous masses of notes collected before the conception of the masterpiece and then crowded in. They are rather "œuvres composées par le dedans, et non pas fabriquées par le dehors." Therefore "la bricabracologie" occupies here only its lawful place.[3] Still, in the lesser works—and in the high-life characters—one may suspect the predominance of bric-a-brac over psychology.

The claims of realism to impersonality and universality of treatment are closely connected with its scientific pretensions. We know how Flaubert fought for the impartial accent and how nearly he reached it in *Madame Bovary*. Zola makes of this "désintéressement" one of his chief doctrinal points. "Le romancier naturaliste affecte de disparaître complètement derrière l'action qu'il raconte." Such an attitude, he says, brings about the absence of moral judgments or indeed of any conclusiveness. Let us have nothing but

[1] Gautier, *Portraits contemporains*, p. 77.

[2] *Rom. nat.*, p. 65.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 111.

facts. "L'auteur n'est pas un moraliste, mais un anatomiste qui se contente de dire ce qu'il trouve dans le cadavre humain." And he objects that Balzac is continually obtruding his own personality.[1]

Now it is true that Balzac frequently interrupts the story with rather inartistic remarks. But what is their nature? Are they simply flamboyant interjections or do they constitute the more serious interference of partial or aggressively moral judgments? In any conflict, does he show too decidedly to which side he leans? If so, one may criticize his pretension to exploit all his known world in a highly scientific and self-suppressing manner.

Here is his famous statement of the scientific (biological) idea, in the *Avant-propos*.[2] After saying that his conception of the *Comédie* as an organism came from a comparison "entre l'humanité et l'animalité," he remarks on the triumph of Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, who showed the unity of composition of life (transformism) as modified into species by environment. Then: "Je vis que sous ce rapport, la société ressemblait à la nature. La société ne fait-elle pas de l'homme, suivant les milieux où son action se déploie, autant d'hommes différents qu'il y a de variétés en zoologie?" The conclusion is that there are "des espèces sociales comme il y a des espèces zoologiques."

Whatever the false analogies, the fertile consequences of this theory for Balzac's fiction impose themselves. It means primarily the division of mankind into trades and professions. It should mean the scientific attitude in the collection and presentation of facts. It should also mean, as Brunetière points out, not only an objectivity from the self-standpoint, but objectivity from the human standpoint, with a tendency to discard all anthropomorphism.[3] Correspondingly, one may expect a certain interest in and development of other sciences—or pseudo-sciences—with the result that the whole earth may be viewed as a sphere for impartial observation. That is the universality I am speaking of, the realistic universality, which is to be carefully distinguished from the classical (Aristotelian) and romantic kinds. "La société française allait être l'historien, je ne

[1] Zola, *Les Romanciers naturalistes*, pp. 128–30.

[2] *Œuvres*, I, 2.

[3] *Honoré de Balzac*, p. 161.

devais être que le secrétaire"[1]—but a secretary who recorded all contemporary history. The *Comédie humaine* will then be a social organism, with its parts linked by the reappearing characters.

The next step will be in the documentary direction. Science, objects Brunetière, now tries to persuade artists "que toutes leurs 'observations,' même les plus vulgaires . . . par la seule vérité du détail et la fidélité photographique de la reproduction, conservent pour l'avenir une valeur assurée de témoignage historique."[2] In Balzac, two kinds of "documents" may be expected: technical disquisitions by the author, with display of erudition in many special fields, and the use of such actual documents as a proclamation by Napoleon or a business prospectus. More widely, there is the conscientious care in "getting up" a subject, the method of Flaubert in *Salammbô*. With reference to this work, Brunetière has a whole damnatory article on "L'Erudition dans le roman."[3] He also finds Balzac too much addicted to this specialization. The novelist's curiosity led him into various *enquêtes*, which transform several stories into so many "recueils de documents." *Le Cousin Pons*, for instance, contains half-a-dozen complete biographies which seem superfluous.[4] Are they really so, or do they sufficiently justify themselves by furnishing that *scientific* solid basis which Brunetière admits? He objects more particularly to "le document physiologique et surtout pathologique." But diseases and deathbeds have their interest both of psychological revelation and of dramatic suspense.

The real dangers of the documentary method are, first, that art and science should not be identified in their aims and technique and, second, that the scientific pretensions of a Zola or a Balzac are likely to be based on superficial knowledge and a mistaken use of science. But be it science or pseudo-science, one is not dispensed from seeking the results, artistic or the reverse, of such influences upon Balzac's fiction. It is generally admitted that positivism and naturalism have many links, of which Taine's essay on Balzac is not the sole example. The novelist is characterized by Oscar Wilde[5] as offering

[1] *Œuvres*, I, 5. [2] *Rom. nat.*, p. 6. [3] *Ibid.*, pp. 27–48.
[4] *Honoré de Balzac*, pp. 155, 158.
[5] In *The Decay of Lying*.

a "most remarkable combination of the artistic temperament with the scientific spirit." It is the latter quality which led Balzac to say and prove that his work had its geography, as it had its genealogy, places, things, persons, and facts.[1] One should then trace out Balzac's divisions and treatment of knowledge, observing how the artist's hand often modified the raw material.

Let us not claim that it always did so. Let us admit the charges of frequent tediousness and ponder its causes. Taine himself admits that Balzac's pedantry is often misplaced. For instance: "Mme Claës, au lit de mort, laisse échapper des allusions physiologiques et des axiomes métaphysiques dont heureusement elle était incapable." This then is the semi-scientific author, talking behind his character, with "ses grands mots, son argot scientifique, son fatras philosophique."[2]

Again, long-windedness may proceed from the superstition of universality, from the compulsion to tell everything. Is it true, as Wright says, that it is especially in Balzac's financial operations that we find "his documentary method, the detailed reproduction of procedure" ?[3] And this critic, among many others, complains of the tediousness of "description and enumeration, to the complete neglect of the plot." We shall have opportunity to test this apparent exaggeration; yet be it noted that even Taine observes that Balzac too often keeps us waiting and the essayist bluntly adds: "Il est désagréable de faire antichambre."[4] Descriptions are too long and, what is perhaps more serious, they are sometimes obscure or not synthesized. "Une description n'est pas une peinture . . . ces compilations ne font rien voir." Only professional physiognomists could see the importance of the Chevalier de Valois' nose, as lengthily portrayed. Such long-windedness, Taine adds, "fausse l'impression," for the imagination sees the object in a flash.[5] A Balzacian description should then be tested in these respects: does it harmonize solidly, does it lead us to visualize, does it require shortening? As will be seen later, a description does frequently harmonize around a central keynote.

[1] *Œuvres*, I, 14.

[2] Taine, *Nouveaux essais de critique et d'histoire*, p. 74.

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 722. [4] Taine, *op. cit.*, p. 67. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 68.

Through lack of restraint, it is certain that latter-day naturalists have drifted into a patient and pointless recording of everything, with a tendency toward mediocrity and triviality of representation. Zola thus defends the method. A typically naturalistic hero must be mediocre. To stage grand or gigantic protagonists, he says, is quite romantic—and Balzacian! Beauty does not consist in enlarging anything, since "an equal level abases all heads"; it consists rather "dans la vérité indiscutable du document humain."[1]

This is sternly intransigent, and we scarcely expect Balzac to measure up to that uninteresting standard. We may find that he still frequently gives heroic proportions to his figures, while making their *circumstances* mediocre or trivial. Brunetière objects to the realistic mania for reflecting "avec une minutieuse et puérile exactitude les moindres accidents de la réalité" and holds that one may represent the humblest lives and their circumstances only on this broad condition: "que dans la profondeur de leur abaissement on fasse luire un rayon d'idéal."[2] Even "tales of mean streets" should be lifted from their environment and sympathetically universalized.

What results from the foregoing as to the two qualities of solidity of workmanship, on the one hand, and of sympathy with ordinary life on the other? Henry James, who thinks of our novelist as toiling through triviality "with huge feet fairly ploughing the sand of our desert," nevertheless roundly declares that "Balzac stands almost alone as an extemporizer achieving closeness and weight, and whom closeness and weight have preserved. . . . . Quantity and intensity are at once and together his sign . . . . [he] did not press hard in some places only to bear lightly in others," by falling into shallowness or sketchiness. Balzac doesn't throw dust in our eyes. He "goes in . . . . for a portentous clearness, a reproduction of the real on the scale of the real. Though . . . . clearness sometimes fails"—that is, *we* fail to see the forest for the trees.[3] Later, James states that "Balzac, like nature herself, abhorred a vacuum."[4]

How is this effect of solidity attained in detail? It is admitted even by Brunetière, even for the half-dozen *dossiers* in *Le Cousin Pons*.

[1] Zola, *Romanciers naturalistes*, pp. 127–28.

[2] *Rom. nat.*, pp. 7, 11.

[3] James, *The Lesson of Balzac*, pp. 70–79. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 105.

The most remote of these help to constitute *milieu* in the first place, and in the second they establish the characters, so to speak, on the *outside* of the story's needs and therefore in a kind of real life.[1] But is it worth while to build up an elaborate past for secondary characters in order that their brief appearances on the scene may accord with the careful "preparations" for their rôles? At any rate: "c'est ce qui donne aux 'dessous' des romans de Balzac leur incomparable solidité."

But Brunetière does not try to make out a case for Balzac as a sympathizer with humble life. That trait he finds mainly in the exotic realists, in Dickens and George Eliot, in Dostoievsky and other Russians. One should compare George Eliot's serenity, her large patience and penetration into the "lot" of the humble, with the sentimental "galimatias" of *Le Lys dans la Vallée*.[2] The danger of an overdone sympathy is, however, the danger of sentimentality. Pathos becomes bathos and the pathetic is really an inferior *genre*, because it confuses "l'émotion presque physique et l'émotion d'art."[3]

How does the main truth of this argument affect Balzac? Does it leave him merely sentimental in his not very frequent passages of pathos? Above all, does it leave him, with reference to the ordinary trend of life, sufficiently interested to retain our interest, whether or not he is moved to more overt sympathy?

The sociological preoccupations of Balzac have already been suggested in quotations from the *Avant-propos*[4] and the subject will receive in a subsequent study the full treatment that it merits. I may indicate here that the *roman de moeurs* is, of its nature, concerned with social types, and that the titles of Balzac's novels frequently suggest his interest in a social status, category, or institution. The greater part of his generalizations and side remarks are also of this character. Brunetière emphasizes these sociological aspects of the *Comédie humaine:* the universality of depiction, the representation by classes, with close study of their *ressorts*, Balzac's crusade in behalf of the family, his Comtism and Catholicism.[5]

[1] *Honoré de Balzac*, pp. 156–57.

[2] *Rom. nat.*, pp. 210–23, *passim*.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

[4] See *supra*, p. 358.

[5] *Honoré de Balzac*, pp. 165 ff.

III. TECHNICAL ELEMENTS

In this division I will only throw out suggestions and provide a working skeleton which can be amplified or arranged to suit each novel. Balzac's fiction will offer generally these elements for analysis:

EXPOSITION: Topography. Order of the *données*. Quantity of space.

PLOT AND COMPOSITION: Cumulative effect. Use of documents and episodes.

CHARACTERS: Accumulation. Harmonizing. Order of the biographical and psychological data.

DESCRIPTION:

1. Subjects
   - *a*) Persons and dress (gestures, keynotes).
   - *b*) Indoor *milieu*.
   - *c*) Outdoor *milieu*. Topography.
   - *d*) Historical background—local color.
   - *e*) Of conditions and manners.
2. Kinds
   - *a*) *En masse*, concentered or not.
   - *b*) By scattered detail—repetitions, etc.

DETAIL: Multiplicity; characteristic or causal; vivid and picturesque; exact and historical; unrelated or insignificant.

STYLE:

1. Kind: Materialistic, technical, "artiste," cumbersome, colorless, or simple.
2. Components: Diction (proper names), technical terms, dialogue, figures, etc.

A Balzacian exposition, like the head of a comet, bulks larger than the rest and frequently tries the patience of the reader. The first thirty or forty pages, especially if there is no break[1] in the volume, will furnish most of the matter for analysis. Much might be quoted from Balzac in defense of his long expositions and descriptions. Occasionally he is apologetic, but more usually he is downright in declaring that such and such a preamble, topographical, socio-historical, or biographical, is essential to the thorough understanding of what follows. That is what the reader should decide

[1] In spite of the usual solid printing of the *Comédie humaine*, Balzac intended that chapter headings and divisions should appear.

in each individual case. Is it better, for instance, to give the personal history of a character at the beginning, simply and perhaps tiresomely, in the old-fashioned way? Or is it better to adopt the method of *in medias res*, as Brunetière praises it in Flaubert: to begin the story at once, then presently "immobilize" the person in a suitable moment of revery and recall within him the previous train of action?[1] In about one-third of his stories, Balzac uses some form of beginning *in medias res;* the question would be why he does so. Another arrangement, as employed by the clever technicians of our rapid days, is to avoid mass at any cost and scatter all forms of description and "informations"[2] in broken fragments throughout.

Is a Balzacian plot a simple or a complex affair? It is said to be fairly simple when the author is mainly interested in displaying character,[3] and it is known to be very complex in such studies as *César Birotteau* and *Une Ténébreuse affaire*, which would require, according to Taine,[4] a financier and a magistrate respectively to follow perfectly their convolutions. Occasionally we have a compound rather than a complex plot. The doubtfully cohering parts of *Le Cousin Pons* or of the *Histoire des Treize* provide a plot of this character. Several critics[5] show how *La Femme de trente ans* is probably the worst case of such patchwork. It consists of six originally distinct short stories, hastily joined together. The heroine had for a time six names and she remains to this day six different characters.

But the critics[6] mostly agree that Balzac's composition is usually of a superior kind, granting that he is at liberty to do something besides narrate. Admitting episodes, "encyclopedic zeal," documents of various kinds and descriptions galore, it is nevertheless contended that he fuses and inspires all this with his central idea. The point then is in each case to determine how such material is linked with the action of the story.

[1] *Le Roman naturaliste*, pp. 161, 163.

[2] Together, often, with dialogue and narration itself—a sort of driving four-in-hand. Flaubert's "tableaux" (e.g., the *comices agricoles*) probably set the pace for this technique.

[3] Lawton, *Balzac*, p. 93.

[4] *Nouveaux essais*, p. 71.

[5] Lovenjoul, Le Breton, Lawton.

[6] Taine, H. James, etc.

In narration proper, is the action swift or dilatory? Is it frequently "decomposed" into so many itemized parts, or what is the novelist's recipe for suggesting the flight of time in a way to combine artistic plausibility with few and simple indications? This has been praised as one of Balzac's best devices. Does he narrate by rapid dialogue in the manner of Dumas *père* and the *roman-feuilleton?* Perhaps the very simplicity of the straight narrative portions will leave them realistic and natural enough,[1] but less susceptible of analysis than the descriptions.

Balzac's characters rise up amid a cluttering environment. They need to be tremendously strong to pass Kipling's test of "standing on their feet," while, so to speak, their household goods sweep by in a flood. Therefore they are frequently monomaniacs, they are possessed by a ruling passion that dominates the book. "Mais ces types énormes," says Lanson, "sont réels, à force de détermination morale et physique."[2] Are they rather types than characters, or are they great as both? Balzac's own ideal was that they should "faire concurrence à l'état civil."[3] Are the secondary characters equally differentiated and by what means? If they bear mainly trade-marks, they may incur Brunetière's dry objection that being a hardware merchant or a cobbler need not greatly differentiate the quality of one's loves or hates.[4] Any character may become stressed by the repetition of a favorite *tic* or "gag," and the *un*realistic side of Balzac may plunge him into the grotesque[5] by way, perhaps, of reaction against dulness and triviality.

As to descriptions, much has already been said. In general, they may be examined for long-windedness and for the relationship of parts. In particular, with reference to any person, one should notice how his dress, physiognomy, and very gestures give the clue to his personality. It is in this connection that the keynote in description may often be determined.[6] Why is Vautrin repeatedly

[1] Even when the game is hampered by technical documentation, says Lanson, "on croit que c'est arrivé" (*Hist. de la litt. franç*, [8th ed.], p. 989).

[2] *Loc. cit.*

[3] *Œuvres*, I, 3.

[4] *Le Roman naturaliste*, p. 132.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 76.

[6] See above, p. 360, and later, Study III.

said to have a "regard profond"? Why does Old Grandet stammer? What is the unifying feature of the detailed features of Marche-à-terre? What significance has the name of a character?

In passing to furniture and the like, one might ask, by way of transition, if Balzac often vivifies inanimate things in the manner of Hugo, Daudet, or Dickens, by making them serve as symbols or monsters. Here is his own opinion of the value of setting: "L'animal a peu de mobilier, il n'a ni arts ni sciences, tandis que l'homme, par une loi qui est à rechercher, tend à représenter ses mœurs, sa pensée et sa vie dans tout ce qu'il approprie à ses besoins."[1] This is the *coquille* idea: that the human animal leaves his imprint on his shell.[2] Brunetière doubts whether our way of dressing and our place of living are so universally linked with our manner of feeling.[3] Yet he holds, somewhat contradictorily, that "les descriptions de Balzac ont toujours quelque raison d'être en dehors d'elles-mêmes" (whereas poetic and romantic description was its own excuse for being)—"et cette raison . . . étant toujours explicative des causes qui ont façonné dans le cours du temps les êtres ou les lieux, les descriptions de Balzac, rien qu'à ce titre, sont donc toujours historiques."[4] That is, they will sometimes have a socio-historical rather than an immediately biographical value. Perhaps the house of the Claës, in the *Recherche de l'absolu*, would be a case in point.

When it comes to a wider topography, the same question of linking still asserts itself. Why, in *Les Chouans*, do we have such a minute description of the Breton countryside? What is the use made generally of local color and historical background? The former, by the way, besides dealing with customs, takes on frequently a philological aspect.

The description of conditions, status, etc., is supposed to be Balzac's *forte*. His novels are naturalistic, says Brunetière, "en premier lieu par la diversité des conditions qu'ils mettent en scène."[5] In this connection only, the critic justifies the novelist's emphasis of money, as gained in a diversity of practical ways. Hence the

[1] *Œuvres*, I, 3.
[2] Cf. Taine, *op. cit.*, p. 70.
[3] *Honoré de Balzac*, p. 175.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 99.
[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 136–40.

ways to gain it are described, made probable, and "realized" concretely in relation to each profession.

With reference to the kinds of description, it may be done *en masse* or *en détail*. In the former case, it should be noticed whether the whole thing is concentered (as above mentioned) for one purpose or from one viewpoint. It is good art, for instance, to take the special viewpoint of a fictional observer and to describe nothing that he would not see. Or the description may be done from an inanimate viewpoint, as when Flaubert notes only those things that lie in the path of a ray of light. Did Balzac so restrict himself? It would be easier to find examples of his centering the description around a main idea, as in *Une Passion dans le désert*, where each touch added to the panther is in order to emphasize her resemblance to a woman. Incidentally, one should also observe the effect of repetitions and of *résumés*.

It is of course multiplied detail that makes a description, and there are those who affirm that Balzac multiplies where he should subtract. "This extravagance is his great fault," says Henry James, "in spite, too, of its all being detail vivified and related, characteristic and constructive."[1] Where is it essentially related and where not, and what effect has mere multiplicity and size upon the reader? Is it usually cumulative, and when it fails of this effect, is it because juxtaposition takes the place of coherence? At times there is certainly a plethora if not a mere juxtaposition of details in Balzac, and Brunetière even indicates this as his second chief claim to be called naturalistic—"par l'abondance, la précision et la minutie de ce genre de détails."[2] Where we do not recognize the necessity of this abundance, it may be due to our shortsightedness or it may be that Balzac is again possessed by the fetish of universality.

He himself assures us that there was a reason for everything he did. "En saisissant bien le sens de cette composition, on reconnaîtra que j'accorde aux faits constants, quotidiens . . . aux actes de la vie individuelle, à leurs causes et à leurs principes, autant d'importance que jusqu'alors les historiens en ont attaché aux évènements de la vie publique des nations."[3] That leads us to speak

[1] *The Lesson of Balzac*, p. 85.

[2] *Honoré de Balzac*, p. 143.

[3] *Œuvres*, I, 12.

of the causal detail, as I have called it, the detail which is truly a joint in the harness. "Il voit avec les détails les lois qui les gouvernent."[1] In Balzac's elaborate scaffoldings, one must evidently test the individual beams, for it is again a question of solidity.

The characteristic detail is slightly different. It may be the crown of causes, it may be simply the salient or the summarizing feature by which we remember a person, a landscape, a season. Brunetière chooses from Flaubert a number which precisely hit off a season or an hour.[2] From *Le Cousin Pons* I may instance the dirty knocker to Fraisier's place of business and from *Le Père Goriot*, in the direction of contrast, the statue of Cupid in the garden of the *pension*. With regard to persons, the characteristic detail often becomes simply a "gag," as in the case of Daudet's lazy actor, "who had not the right to renounce his art."

The picturesque detail is sometimes one and the same with the foregoing, or it may exist primarily for its own vividness. For instance, it is a frequent touch in fiction, found both in Balzac and Flaubert, to have sunlight strike upon the weapons of a distant army, revealing it distinctly for that moment.[3]

The exact and technical kind of detail scarcely needs definition. Brunetière notes that a number of this kind are brought in through money dealings.[4] Maigron, in his book on the influence of Sir Walter Scott, observes that Balzac drew from that author "cette foule de détails précis—les seuls caractéristiques"[5]—and then applied them to everyday life. Balzac's care for exactness in detail is well known. He and Stendhal were practically the first to set themselves a severe standard for the depiction of contemporary life with minute precision. Balzac's journeys in search of close local color, his zeal in seeking for the right house, the right street, the right name—witness the Z. Marcas story—often brought the right results. Sometimes it led him into insignificant, merely photographic or microscopic representation. Sometimes detail is really useless,

[1] Taine, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

[2] *Le Roman naturaliste*, p. 168.

[3] At the beginning of *Les Chouans* and of *Salammbô*.

[4] *Honoré de Balzac*, p. 140.

[5] Maigron, *Le Roman historique à l'époque romantique*, p. 230.

whether it is true or not; but occasionally also it gets its effect through being apparently unrelated. It may serve for contrast, it may serve simply to illustrate the indifference of things, as when Tess of the d'Urbervilles is attended, at a critical moment in her fortunes, by a piece of soiled paper blowing aimlessly about.

As to style, I will briefly suggest the possibilities. It may have in different places any or several of the characteristics enumerated. If it is materialized to start with, that kind of style is likely to bring certain of the other qualities in its train. What Brunetière indicates for another novelist may occur in Balzac. There may be something "lourdement sensuel" even in presumably idyllic parts, or the design may disappear "sous l'empâtement des couleurs."[1] In the heavy and involved passages, Balzac seems deliberately to thicken the medium through his desire to tell everything. There will be found Rabelaisian catalogues, exclamatory and rhetorical sentences, above all masses of technical expressions, for the use of the *mot propre* is considered one of Balzac's prominent traits. His style is adapted to all circumstances and is therefore by turns simple or forceful, pedantic or technical, sometimes "artiste," sometimes neologic or smacking of what he called "la bricabracologie"—which term is itself a monstrous neologism. Taine calls this style a gigantic chaos and remarks what effects are attained by comparison (through analogy and figures) of the scientific with the sentimental world. For instance, he quotes a gorgeous passage in which love is expressed in terms of botany.[2]

Such figures as these are not infrequent, and one may recall how George Eliot's scientific interests worked in a similar direction. There is also the more usual class of simply natural figures, sometimes employed with strict appropriateness: a farmer or a soldier will draw his comparisons from his own field. It would be worth while to observe whether Balzac makes much use of that inverted type of figure which expresses nature by comparisons with art. This is opposed to the Aristotelian tradition but is, I believe, fairly common in the nineteenth century. Does our author affect the Flaubertian kind of figure which Brunetière defines as "la traduction

[1] *Le Roman naturaliste*, p. 15.

[2] *Nouveaux essais*, pp. 91–92.

du sentiment par quelque sensation exactement correspondante."[1] Certainly, here as elsewhere, Balzac leans to exactness and vividness, and it will be desirable to pick out those figures which show most of these qualities.

In criticizing dialogue, the question of naturalness and appropriateness to each character should come first. What about Hulot's military slang and Rastignac's description of high life? Is dialogue interspersed with description, for relief and illustration? One may note the arrangement of single speeches between paragraphs of description; also speeches in chorus and "sliced dialogue." Henry James holds firmly that dialogue, admirable for illustration, should not be used for constructive purposes, and he believes that Balzac followed this "law."[2] On the contrary, we will find that Balzac frequently uses dialogue in order to narrate; and often it forwards the story in a dramatic way, because it is the way of the drama.

In this introductory study, I have been occupied with stating problems according to the critics and the general probabilities. Subsequent studies will endeavor to solve or illustrate these problems, keeping mainly to the analysis of realism here given.

E. PRESTON DARGAN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[To be continued]

[1] *Le Roman naturaliste*, pp. 156 f. An example would be Emma's dreams falling in the mud, *like wounded swallows*.

[2] James, *op. cit.*, pp. 111–12.

THE INDIVIDUAL HUMAN DRAMATIS PERSONAE OF THE *DIVINE COMEDY*

The main purpose of this study is to emphasize the vastness of the field of knowledge of legend, history, and contemporary affairs from which Dante drew the dramatis personae of his *Divine Comedy*. Mention will also be made of various matters of interest concerning the derivation, identification, and distribution of these characters.

Dante assigns 332 individual human dramatis personae to the three divisions of his after-world. This count excludes angels, demons,[1] the allegorical figures of the procession in the Earthly Paradise, persons mentioned but not assigned to one of the three divisions (e.g., Theseus, Guido Cavalcanti), and undifferentiated members of such groups as the "più di mille Ombre" of *Inf.* V, 67–68. Those whose names appear in Roman type in the following lists are located in Hell; italic type indicates location in Purgatory; small capitals indicate location in Paradise. Those whose names are parenthesized are not seen by Dante. Those whose names are preceded by an asterisk speak.

I have used Professor C. H. Grandgent's edition of the *Divina commedia*, relying on his decision in cases of disputed identity. I have also used the notes to the Torraca text, Paget Toynbee's *Dante Dictionary*, G. A. Scartazzini's *Enciclopedia dantesca*, and E. G. Gardner's *Dante*. I am chiefly indebted to Professor E. H. Wilkins for assistance in this work.

A. The Bible (48 persons):

I. Old Testament (33): (Abel), (Abraham), *Adam, David, Eve, Hezekiah, (Isaac), (Jacob), ([Twelve] Sons of Jacob), Joshua, Moses, Nathan the Prophet, *Nimrod, (Noah), Potiphar's Wife, Rachel, Rahab, Rebecca, Ruth, (Samuel), Sarah, *Solomon.

II. Apocrypha (2): Judas Maccabaeus, Judith.

III. New Testament (13): Anna, (Annas), Caiaphas, Christ, Dionysius the Areopagite, *James, *John, John the Baptist, Judas, Mary, (Paul), *Peter, (Simon Magus).

[1] But includes Cacus and the Giants, who are being punished for their sins on earth.

B. Greek (58):

I. Legend (37): Achilles, Aeneas, Amphiaraus, Antaeus, (Antigone), (Argia), (Briareus), Cacus, *Capaneus, (Deidamia), (Deidamia's Sisters),[1] (Deiphile), Diomed, Electra, Ephialtes, Eurypylus, Hector, Helen, (Hypsipyle), (Ismene), Jason, Manto, Myrra, Orpheus, Paris, Penthesilea, (Pyrrhus), RIPHEUS, Semiramis, Sinon, Thais, (Thetis), Tiresias, (Tityos), (Typhon), *Ulysses.

II. History to 100 A.D. (21): (Agathon), Alexander, Anaxagoras, (Antiphon), Aristotle, Democritus, Diogenes, Dionysius of Syracuse, Dioscorides, Empedocles, (Epicurus), Euclid, (Euripides), Heraclitus, Hippocrates, *Homer, Plato, (Simonides), Socrates, Thales, Zeno.

C. Roman (31):

I. Legend (4): Camilla, Dido, Latinus, Lavinia.

II. History to 100 A.D. (27):

1. Kingdom (2): Lucius Junius Brutus, Lucretia.
2. Republic (15): Aruns, Brutus, (Caecilius), Caesar, Cassius, **Cato*, Cicero, Cleopatra, Cornelia, Curio, Julia, Marcia, (Plautus), (Sextus), (Terence).
3. Empire (10): *Horace, (Juvenal), Livy, *Lucan, (Lucius Varius), *Ovid, (Persius), Seneca, **Statius*, *Virgil.

D. 100–600 A.D. (23): (Pope Anastasius), (Attila), ST. AUGUSTINE, *ST. BENEDICT, BOETHIUS, (CALIXTUS I), EMPEROR CONSTANTINE, DONATUS, Galen, (POPE GREGORY I [ST. GREGORY]), ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, *EMPEROR JUSTINIAN, LUCIA, ST. MACARIUS, (Modred), PAULUS OROSIUS, (PIUS I), (Priscian), Ptolemy, (SIXTUS I), EMPEROR TRAJAN, Tristan, (URBAN I).

E. 600–1100 A.D. (18): Alî, ST. ANSELM, Avicenna, BEDE, (MOTHER OF CACCIAGUIDA), CHARLEMAGNE, (Ganelon), GODFREY OF BOUILLON, **Hugh Capet*, ST. ISIDORE OF SEVILLE, *Mahomet, *ST. PETER DAMIAN, RABANUS MAURUS, RENOART, ROBERT GUISCARD, ROLAND, ST. ROMUALDUS, WILLIAM OF ORANGE.

F. Twelfth Century (17):

I. Italian (8): (*Alighiero*), *CACCIAGUIDA, CONSTANCE, GRATIAN, JOACHIM OF FLORA, PETER LOMBARD, **Abbot of San Zeno*, WILLIAM II OF SICILY.

[1] As Dante evidently took this reference (*Purg.* XXII, 114) direct from Statius (giving more of the incident in *Inf.* XXVI, 62, and *Purg.* IX, 34–39, as told by that poet), and Statius does not tell how many sisters there were, Dante probably had no definite number in mind. Baumeister's *Denkmäler*, I, 6, pictures a frieze on a Vatican sarcophagus in which *five* sisters appear. I have been unable to find any text that justifies this number, however, and have counted the sisters as two.

II. Non-Italian (9): **Arnault Daniel*, Averrhoës, *St. Bernard, *Bertran de Born, *Henry III of England*, Hugh of St. Victor, Petrus Comestor, Richard of St. Victor, Saladin.

G. Thirteenth Century (122):

I. Italian (103):

1. 1200–1275 (46):

a) Lombardy (3): Buoso da Duera, **Sordello*, Tesauro di Beccheria.

b) Venetia (3): Azzolino, *Cunizza, Jacomo da Sant' Andrea.

c) Emilia (8): Asdente, *Catalano, (Francesco d'Accorso), **Guido del Duca*, **Guido Guinizelli*, *Loderingo, (Ottaviano degli Ubaldini), **Rinier da Calbolo*.

d) Tuscany (22): Alessandro degli Alberti, (Arrigo), *Bocca degli Abati, *Brunetto Latini, *Cavalcante de' Cavalcanti, **Corrado Malaspina*, *Farinata, (Focaccia de' Cancellieri), (Geri del Bello), (Gianni de' Soldanieri), *Griffolino, *Guido Guerra, *Jacopo Rusticucci, *Mosca de' Lamberti, Napoleone degli Alberti, **Omberto Aldobrandeschi*, *Provenzan Salvani*, Puccio Sciancato, (Rinier Pazzo), **Sapia*, *Tegghiaio Aldobrandi, *Ubaldin dalla Pila*.

e) Umbria (3): (St. Clare), St. Francis, Illuminato.

f) Latium (2): *St. Bonaventura, *Pope Nicholas III.

g) Campania (3): Agostino, *Pier delle Vigne, *St. Thomas Aquinas.

h) Sicily (2): (Emperor Frederick II), **Manfred*.

2. 1275–1300 (57):

a) Piedmont (1): *Marquis William of Montferrat*.

b) Liguria (1): **Pope Adrian V*.

c) Lombardy (2): *Maestro Adamo, **Marco Lombardo*.

d) Venetia (1): *One of the Scrovigni.

e) Emilia (9): *Bonifazio de' Fieschi*, *Francesca da Rimini, Guido Bonatti, *Messer Marchese*, Obizzo da Este, Paolo Malatesta, *Pier da Medicina, (Tebaldello), *Venedico Caccianimico.

f) Tuscany (35): Agnello, *Alessio Interminei, (Andrea di Mozzi), *Beatrice, **Belacqua*, *Benincasa di Laterina*, **Bonagiunta*, Buoso, *Camicion de' Pazzi, *Capocchio, **Casella*, *Ciacco, Cianfa Donati, *Federigo Novello*, *Filippo Argenti, **Forese Donati*, One of the Gianfigliazzi, Gianni Schicchi, *Giovanni da Pisa*, *Guccio Tarlati*, Guercio de' Cavalcanti, Guglielmo Borsiere, (Guido da Romena), Lano, **La Pia*, *Lotto degli Agli, **Matilda*, *Orso degli Alberti*,

*PICCARDA, (Rinier da Corneto), Archbishop Ruggieri, Sassol Mascheroni, One of the Ubriachi, *Ugolino, *Vanni Fucci.

g) Marches (3): **Buonconte da Montefeltro*, *Guido da Montefeltro, **Jacopo del Cassero*.

h) Umbria (1): **Oderisi d' Agobbio*.

i) Abruzzi (1): Pope Celestine V.

j) Sardinia (3): (Fra Gomita), (Michel Zanche), **Nino de' Visconti*.

II. Non-Italian (19):

1. Belgium, France, Navarre (9): *Charles I of Anjou*, *Ciampolo di Navarra, *FOLQUET DE MARSELHA, *Henry of Navarre*, *Pope Martin IV*, *Philip III of France*, *Pierre de La Brosse*, (ROMEO), SIGER OF BRABANT.
2. Spain (4): *Alfonso III of Aragon*, (ST. DOMINIC[1]), POPE JOHN XXI [PETER OF SPAIN], *Peter III of Aragon*.
3. England, Scotland (2): Guy of Montfort, Michael Scot.
4. Austria, Bohemia, Hungary (4): ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *CHARLES MARTEL, *Ottocar of Bohemia*, *Emperor Rudolph of Hapsburg*.

H. Fourteenth Century (15):

I. Italian (13):

1. Venetia (1): (Vitaliano).
2. Liguria (2): Branca d'Oria, (Relative of Branca d'Oria).
3. Emilia (2): *Alberigo de' Manfredi, (Gian Ciotto).
4. Tuscany (7): (Alessandro da Romena), (Brother of Alessandro da Romena), (Bonturo), (Carlino de' Pazzi), (Corso Donati), **Dante*[2] (Gianni Buiamonte).
5. Latium (1): (Pope Boniface VIII).

II. Non-Italian (2):

1. France (1): (Pope Clement V).
2. Germany (1): (EMPEROR HENRY VII).

A glance through the list shows the tremendous range of the poet's dramatic vision. He draws his characters from legend and from history, from early times down through every century of the Christian era; from Europe, Asia, and Africa.

Among the historical characters twenty centuries are represented, and sixteen of the nations of Europe, as well as some minor countries

[1] In *Par.* XII, 31–105, St. Bonaventura tells St. Dominic's story in such a way that there can be no possible doubt of Dante's intention to assign him to Paradise.

[2] Since Dante must pass through Purgatory before attaining Paradise, and since he refers to his future participation in the punishments there, he is assigned to Purgatory (see below, p. 378).

in Asia and Africa. There follow examples from every century and from the European nations:

Sixth century B.C., Thales; fifth, Socrates; fourth, Aristotle; third, Epicurus; second, Zeno; first, Lucius Junius Brutus; first A.D., Statius; second, Galen; third, Lucia; fourth, St. John Chrysostom; fifth, Pope Anastasius; sixth, St. Benedict; seventh, St. Isidore; eighth, Bede; ninth, Charlemagne; tenth, Hugh Capet; eleventh, St. Anselm; twelfth, Arnault Daniel; thirteenth, St. Francis; fourteenth, Henry VII.

Greece, Homer; Rome, Caesar; England, Guy of Montfort; Scotland, Richard of St. Victor; France, St. Bernard; Belgium, Godfrey of Bouillon; Provence, Bertran de Born; Navarre, Ciampolo; Spain, Paulus Orosius; Italy, Farinata; Germany, Rabanus Maurus; Austria, Rudolph of Hapsburg; Hungary, Albertus Magnus; Bohemia, Ottocar.

The same breadth of range appears in the selection of spirits in many of the special groups. In the second circle of the Inferno, though only nine of the great lovers are named, they are taken from Egypt, Assyria, Greece, Rome, Troy, the Arthurian Cycle, and modern Italy. In the first *girone* of the seventh circle are persons from Africa of the first century, third- and fourth-century Greeks, a fifth-century Hun, modern Italians, and a modern Englishman. The ninth *bolgia* holds representatives from the third century B.C. in Rome, the seventh century in Arabia, the twelfth century in Provence, and modern Italy. In the Vale of Princes are rulers from Italy, France, England, Spain, and Austria. The three men recognized on the fifth terrace of Purgatory are taken from the first century in Rome, the tenth century in France, and modern Italy. In the Heaven of Mars the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, the *Chansons de geste*, and the eleventh century in Belgium and Italy are represented.

Modern Italians (i.e., from the twelfth to the fourteenth century) are found in every one of the main subdivisions (Circles, Terraces, Heavens, etc.) in which souls are recognized, with the exception of Limbus, the Shore of the Island, and the Heavens of Mercury, Saturn, and the Fixed Stars.

Nearly one-third of all the people in the *Divine Comedy* were active just preceding or during Dante's lifetime. With all his knowledge of history and legend he was constantly alive to the world of literature and politics of his own day and country. He takes people

from all but three (Apulia, Basilicata, and Calabria) of the main provinces of Italy and from all of the important cities. By far the largest representation is, as is natural, from Tuscany.

That the largest part in the *Divine Comedy* is played by modern Italians is emphasized by the fact that of the 81 persons who hold converse with Dante during the whole journey, 55 are of this group. Of the other 26, 3 are Old Testament characters, 3 from the New Testament, 3 Greeks, 6 Romans, 2 from 100 to 600 A.D., 3 from 600 to 1100 A.D., and for the period after 1100, 3 Provençals, 1 Frenchman, 1 Navarrese, and 1 Hungarian.

Many varying devices are used in the identification of the characters. Of the 243 spirits whom Dante sees, 55 are not named. They are identified by descriptions of their appearance: Charles I of Anjou is "colui dal maschio naso," Henry of Navarre is distinguished by his "benigno aspetto"; by brief autobiographies: Francesca, Pier delle Vigne, Charles Martel; by their family arms: one member each of the Gianfigliazzi, Ubriachi, and Scrovigni families; by their relatives, home, or both; Cavalcante de' Cavalcanti is known by Dante's words, "Guido vostro," the naming of the Bisenzio valley and their father denotes the Alberti brothers; by brief phrases denoting some outstanding quality or fact: "colui Che fece per viltà il gran rifiuto," "il maestro di color che sanno," "colei che s'ancise amorosa E ruppe fede al cener di Sicheo."

Dante himself recognizes 66 spirits by face, by voice, or merely by the place or condition in which he finds them. Virgil identifies 34 spirits; Beatrice, strangely enough, only 4 (James, John, Adam, and Mary); and St. Bernard, 13. The guardian Nessus identifies 5 spirits; 78 spirits are identified by their companions, 9 of these by Sordello and 6 by the Eagle, while 43 spirits identify themselves.

Of all the individual human dramatis personae 186 are in Hell, 47 in Purgatory, and 99 in Paradise. By no means all of these souls are introduced in the account of the division in which they are located. In some cases their location is referred to, definitely or indefinitely, before the place in question is reached, and is confirmed by sight in that place. Thus in *Inf.* IV Virgil mentions Adam, Moses, David, and Rachel as taken to Heaven at the time of the Harrowing of Hell, and Dante sees them in Paradise. In *Inf.* VI he hears of Farinata,

Tegghiaio, Jacopo Rusticucci, and Mosca, whom he later finds "tra le anime più nere." Piccarda's appearance in Paradise is prepared for in *Purg.* XXIV. In like manner are prophesied the appearances of the two Johns, Mary, St. Francis, and Peter.

In other cases the location of a soul is referred to *before* the place in question is reached, and is *not* confirmed thereafter. Instances of this are: Abel, Noah, Abraham, Jacob, Isaac, Twelve Sons of Jacob, Arrigo, St. Clare, Samuel, St. Dominic, Mother of Cacciaguida, Sixtus I, Pius I, Calixtus I, Urban I, Paul, St. Gregory.

In still other cases the presence of a soul in a given location is not mentioned until after the account of that location is passed. Instances of this are: Geri del Bello, the twenty Greeks and Romans named in *Purg.* XXII, and Alighiero. Manto, though referred to by Virgil in *Purg.* XXII, 13, as dwelling in Limbus, by a strange inconsistency appears also in the fourth *bolgia* of the eighth circle.

In Limbus are more dramatis personae than in any other one secondary division in the *Commedia*, and more than in the whole of Purgatory. Dante sees there 40 spirits, and later (*Purg.* XXII, see above) he locates there 20 more. In the Fourth Heaven we find the second largest single group in the *Divine Comedy*, the so-called twenty-four theologians. (Donatus is the only one of the group whose work is not theological in character.) In these two groups Dante finds the majority of the men whose works were his most important sources.

Of all the persons listed, 243 are seen by Dante; 81 of these speak with him. The remaining 88 (excluding Dante and including Manto) do not appear at all, but are mentioned as belonging to one of the three main divisions, and in the majority of cases are assigned to definite places. Of these 88 spirits, 50 are mentioned out of place (see above) and 11 are located by prophecy as in the case of Henry VII (see below, p. 378). Of the remaining 27, 14 are named by companion spirits—as when Farinata locates "lo secondo Federico E il Cardinale"; 5 by Virgil; 5 by the demon Nessus; 2, Simon Magus and Briareus, by Dante himself; and 1, Anastasius, by the inscription on his tomb.

Of all the characters of the *Divine Comedy*, 15 are given definite places in eternity, although they were still alive in 1300. Of these,

Dante prophetically assigns 13 to Hell. The first, Gian Ciotto, Francesca refers to with the words, "Caïna attende chi vita ci spense" (*Inf.* V, 107). The second and third, Vitaliano and Gianni Buiamonte, have their coming anticipated by the bearer of the Scrovigni arms (*Inf.* XVII, 68 ff.). The popes Boniface VIII and Clement V are located by Nicholas III, who first mistakes Dante for Boniface, and later calls Clement "un pastor senza legge," who will be buried in the same rock with his predecessor (*Inf.* XIX, 52 ff.). The sixth man, Bonturo, one of the Malebranche designates by the ironical remark (*Inf.* XXI, 39–41):

> . . . . io torno per anche
> A quella terra ch'i'n'ho ben fornita:
> Ognun v'è barattier, fuor che Bonturo.

Maestro Adamo locates the two da Romena brothers by longing for their participation in the same punishment he is enduring (*Inf.* XXX, 76 ff.). The ninth man, Carlino de' Pazzi, is eagerly awaited by his kinsman Camicione, that the greater sinner may make the lesser seem innocent by comparison (*Inf.* XXXII, 69 ff.). In Tolomea three souls actually appear in Hell while their bodies are still moving about on earth—the traitors Alberigo de' Manfredi, Branca d' Oria, and "un suo prossimano." The death and damnation of the thirteenth man, Corso Donati, are foretold in Purgatory by his brother Forese (*Purg.* XXIV, 82 ff.). To the fourteenth man, Henry VII, a seat is assigned in Paradise in a prophecy uttered by Beatrice in the Empyrean.

The last man of the group is Dante himself. His ultimate salvation is foretold in several passages of the *Divine Comedy*, as follows:

> . . . . Per altra via, per altri porti
> Verrai a piaggia, non qui, per passare;
> Più lieve legno convien che ti porti (*Inf.* III, 91–93).

> . . . . per tornare altra volta
> . . . . fo io questo viaggio (*Purg.* II, 91, 92).

> . . . . sono in prima vita,
> Ancor che l'altra sì andando acquisti (*Purg.* VIII, 59, 60).

> Gli occhi . . . . mi fieno ancor qui tolti (*Purg.* XIII, 133).

Quinci su vo per non esser più cieco (*Purg.* XXVI, 58).

Beato te, che delle nostre marche . . . .
Per morir meglio esperienza imbarche! (*Purg.* XXVI, 73, 75.)

E sarai meco senza fine cive
Di quella Roma onde Cristo è Romano (*Purg.* XXXII, 101, 102).

. . . . *sicut tibi, cui*
Bis unquam coeli ianūa reclusa? (*Par.* XV, 29, 30.)

Qui vedrai l'una e l'altra milizia
Di Paradiso, e l'una in quegli aspetti
Che tu vedrai all'ultima giustizia (*Par.* XXX, 43–45).

Prima che tu a queste nozze ceni (*Par.* XXX, 135).

Of the thirteen men prophetically assigned to Hell the majority died before or during the writing of the *Commedia.* There is uncertainty as to the dates of the deaths of Vitaliano, Carlino de' Pazzi, and Alberigo de' Manfredi. Alessandro da Romena was alive in 1316, and the brother mentioned in *Inf.* XXX, 77, Scartazzini says, was Aghinolfo, who was still alive in 1338. He also tells us that in 1325 there was living in Florence a Giovanni Buiamonte, who may have been the "cavalier sovrano" (*Inf.* XVII, 72). That Branca d'Oria was alive for several years after Dante's death there seems to be no doubt.

Of the nine popes among the dramatis personae, two (John XXI and Gregory I) have attained Paradise, two (Adrian V and Martin IV) are working out their salvation in Purgatory, and five (Celestine V, Anastasius, Nicholas III, Boniface VIII, and Clement V) are in Hell.

Of the seven emperors, Frederick II is in Hell, Rudolph of Hapsburg is in Purgatory, and Justinian, Charlemagne, Trajan, Constantine, and Henry VII are in Paradise.

Four members of Dante's family are referred to. His great-great-great-grandmother is assigned to Paradise by Cacciaguida with the words, "mia madre, ch'è or santa" (*Par.* XVI, 35). Cacciaguida himself is the only one of the group whom Dante actually sees. He tells of his son, Alighiero, the first man to bear the name, and the

great-grandfather of the poet. He has been wandering about "cent' anni e più" on the first terrace of Purgatory bearing the burden of the proud. Geri del Bello, schismatic and murderer, a cousin of Dante's father, is in the ninth *bolgia*.

There are nine personal friends of Dante, with all of whom he holds converse. Only the first he places in Hell. These are: Brunetto Latini, Belacqua, Nino de' Visconti, Forese Donati, Casella, Matilda, Piccarda, Charles Martel, Beatrice.

There are 82 men of letters among the dramatis personae, making about 25 per cent of the whole. Ten of these lived in Dante's time. He talks with nine of them and with sixteen of the older writers.

There are only 45 women in the list, and of these the seven who speak to Dante are thirteenth-century Italians. Though there is a small part as far as numbers are concerned, they do in a sense lend color to the whole *Divine Comedy*. In the opening scenes of the *Inferno* the influence of Mary, Lucia, and Beatrice is strongly felt, though they do not appear in person. The story of Francesca da Rimini is the most familiar episode in the poem. In the words of La Pia, brief as they are, is condensed the tragedy of a whole life. With the pageant in the Earthly Paradise appears Beatrice herself, and thereafter the poem is dominated by her presence. For her Dante has written

Quello che mai non fu detto d'alcuna.

DOROTHY LISTER SIMONS

CHICAGO, ILL.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

SOME WAR NOVELS WITH SOLDIERS AS HEROES

Three books stand out decidedly as the best attempts to depict types of the soldier of the Great War. The material is practically all borrowed from reality; art, however, is allowed to play a part in the grouping of events, in the selection of characteristic traits, occasionally in the focusing of such traits as will render the picture clearer to the reader.

One is René Benjamin's *Gaspard*, the first to come out (1915). This book will hold its own, not only against the other more recent war books, but even after the war. Gaspard will remain a type in French literature, such, let us say, as Molière's Scapin, Daudet's Tartarin, Hugo's Gavroche, or Aicard's Maurin des Maures. Indeed the name Gaspard has already passed into the language to designate the intelligent, alert man of the people of France, or rather of Paris, the man of perfectly unsophisticated brain, who has a genius for acting kindly, is always ready to help, is doing, without seeming to think of it at all, the most beautiful things; picturesque in speech, droll in manner, sound in mind as a red apple, transparent as glass, true as steel. This is the French soldier which the general public, especially abroad, likes to imagine—and perfectly legitimately; Gaspards are more likely to be found in the French army than elsewhere, although nobody would think that all are Gaspards in the French army.[1]

The second book is *Bourru, soldat de Vauquois* (1916) by Jean des Vignes Rouges. It corresponds to the second period of the war, when the hell of the trenches rendered the life of the soldier much harder and stripped war of much of the *heroï-romanesque* which would otherwise, to some extent, extenuate its horrors. Of course, in *Gaspard* we had not really much of war itself; we had the mobilization period, and just two episodes on the front; after the first, the wounding, nursing, and convalescence of Gaspard; after the second, his return home as a cripple. Gaspard was still a civilian, accidentally mixed up with the war, who had kept in the army his attitude of everyday life. For Bourru, civilian life is a dear remembrance only, he has become a soldier through and through, and very few pages of the book are not pictures of war, and war of the fiercest sort and at one of the worst spots on the whole battle line. Bourru—who, besides, is not a witty shopkeeper of Montmartre in Paris, but a peasant from Burgundy, with the qualities of his race, intelligent, energetic, quiet—has not the cheerfulness of Gaspard;

[1] René Benjamin has published a second book, *Sous le ciel de France*, and very recently another novel *Le Major Pipe et son père* (Fayard, 1918), the story of a newspaper man who at first dislikes the British heartily but later grows enthusiastically fond of them.

he is *bourru* ("a grumbler"), but as a soldier he is just as brave and good as Gaspard; and perhaps because he has not that cheerfulness to help him out in his trials he is the more admirable in his behavior. Although not as entertaining as Gaspard, he represents probably more truly the average fine soldier of France.[1]

The third book is Barbusse's *Le Feu*. It pictures the soldiers in the trenches when the third year of war was in sight. If the soldier could still be courageous in facing grim reality, nobody could expect of him, nobody would accept as genuine, the everlasting cheerfulness of Gaspard; even to expect the grumbling good-naturedness of Bourru would be expecting a great deal. And indeed *Le Feu* is most depressing and at the same time has what people call the most realistic descriptions of trench warfare.

Le Feu is easily the most-discussed book of the war. And for the writer of literary history in the future it will be well to keep in mind the following data. Of course a work is never read and judged entirely from the point of view of its artistic value. We need only recall famous examples such as *la querelle du Cid*, in which the personal jealousies of Scudéri and Richelieu played an essential part; such as the personal episode which gave to human art Musset's *Les Nuits* and *Le Souvenir* and presupposes the knowledge of the controversy of *Elle et Lui* and *Lui et Elle;* or again such as Maupassant's famous story *Le Horla*, which must be explained by the family antecedents of the *nouvelliste*. *Le Feu* is a new and remarkable example of this.

What aroused so much comment about *Le Feu*—praise on the one hand and criticism on the other—is the tone of the book, which appears to many to be not only realistic (which would be legitimate) but in part plainly cynical. There are those who see in so brutal a picture a sane, even a necessary reaction against the silly optimism prevailing in many quarters. The stupid pictures which represented the French soldiers as enjoying life thoroughly in the trenches—as if every one of them was eager for nothing but to die for his country, as if he charged the enemy always in a state of sublime exaltation, and when lying wounded in the hospital had but one thought only, to return as soon as possible to sacrifice whatever limb was left to him—seemed to them absurd, unjust, and immoral. Thus Barbusse, they would argue, was fully justified even in overdrawing the picture in order to stop such misconceptions.

But there are those on the other hand who lay stress on another phase of the problem. The book came out, they remark, just at the darkest period of the war, when France was finding it so hard to keep up the spirits of her children in the terrific struggle. It was therefore very wrong, in such an hour, to speak words of discouragement. To tell the truth to a sick man when the truth may kill him, while mere abstention from saying anything may allow him to pull through, is not right.

[1] Some very interesting information is given in the book about the underground warfare carried on by the sappers and miners (for which topic see also *La Guerre souterraine* by Captain Danrit). Two other books have come out (1917) by J. des Vignes Rouges, *L'Ame des chefs*, and a novel, *André Rieu, officier de France*.

Moreover the charge was brought against Barbusse that the book was realistic in the sense of "shocking," but not realistic in the sense of "true." An army composed of such men as described in *Le Feu* could not have achieved what the French army *did* achieve; again the men in the squad are all non-thinking men who cannot realize the meaning of the struggle (see, for example, Mauclair, in the *Semaine littéraire*). French officers and soldiers, it might be stated, have repeatedly protested, and they are in a position to know as well as Barbusse; they have sometimes pronounced the book "criminal" (one example of such protest appeared in the *New York Times*).[1]

We have just recalled the part of a famous minister, Richelieu, in a famous literary *querelle;* here also the historian of the future will have to examine the possible part of a minister in the *querelle du Feu.* No secret is made, especially in the last pages of the book under consideration, of the author's disbelief in the idea of *patrie.* The question then arose: How is it that books much less outspoken on much less paramount issues should have been pitilessly censured while *Le Feu* was not? And how is it that this book belittling patriotism should be allowed to come out just at the time when these very ideas were used by German propaganda trying desperately to create a demand for peace in France? A plausible answer was made repeatedly and openly: because the minister of the interior was then Malvy, who was later charged with treason; Malvy allowed the book to pass (see the article in the *New York Times* already mentioned). On this special point a careful reading of the book may to a certain extent absolve Barbusse; while, theoretically, Barbusse is opposed to purely national pursuits and advocates human ideals, yet in this concrete case of the Great War he believes that France is waging a just fight. In other words, unless new arguments are brought forward, one can only make this statement, that German propagandists may have used the book of Barbusse in a way of which he himself may have disapproved. As far as the writer knows, Barbusse never took the trouble to answer the critics. This may be pride.[2]

The historian of literature of the future will have to take into consideration another point when he wishes to explain the *cas Barbusse.* Surely the author was led by temperament to the morbid attitude he assumed toward

[1] Here are the words of a man who has won great esteem among American scholars, Lucien Foulet: "The book contains some good, some bad; without entering into any detail I will tell you that as far as the life of the trenches is concerned, it is in no way a faithful rendering. I have passed twenty-one months in the trenches and I know what it is. As for the language of the 'poilu,' he idealises it from certain points of view, and renders it extraordinarily vulgar at times." (From a private letter).

[2] Concerning the success of the book in America the situation is about the same as in France, namely, that it is quite possible that German agents helped in advertising *Le Feu;* but *Under Fire* was published by a firm (Dutton) which has shown strong pro-Ally tendencies and therefore could be accused only of imprudence. It was an unfortunate fact that the translation came out just at the time when American public opinion had to decide whether or not America should enter the war; it did not, however, stem the tide.

the soldier. Barbusse is the man who, some years before *Le Feu*, had written *L'Enfer*, which is about the most impure and morbid book any man may wish to handle. There are many ways of expressing despairing and disgusted views of life; the literature of all ages shows this, from Buddha and Khayyam to Leopardi, Schopenhauer, and Baudelaire. Why did Barbusse choose the most repulsive? It seems quite natural that a man so disposed should, once the war had, so to speak, forced upon him the heroes of the trenches, write about them as he had written about the disgusting (even if perhaps real) creatures he had described before, namely in an abnormal, insane fashion.

The writer would go even farther. Surely a large part of the regrettable popularity of *Le Feu*, in France as in this country, rests with the public. It is partly an effect of the modern craze for the sensational, the abnormal, and the morbid. You think naturally of a woman as a charming, graceful, kind creature, and you consider it the duty of "real," "true," "original" art, so to speak, to represent her as wilful, masculine, and cruel. Your normal idea of a clergyman is that of a conventional, sincere, and honest man, but he becomes "artistically" interesting only when he is represented unconventional, shrewd, satanic. And so the picture of a soldier which comes first to your mind is that of a vigorous, fine, heroic fellow, but a book representing him as shockingly non-heroic, homesick, and avoiding hardships ought to be then the soldier of the "original, superior artist"; it would be terribly bourgeois not to accept this distressing picture, and this is a good chance for one who feels the soul of a Philistine within himself to make the world believe that he is none himself.

Those who seek in war literature strong sensation because they think that the terrible and the sickening are inseparable from this literature need not read *Le Feu*, which leaves behind a distinctly bad smell. There are only too many others to suggest. As we have mentioned novels only, we shall do no more than give a few titles in addition to *Bourru, soldat de Vauquois*, already mentioned, namely, Lieutenant Péricard, *Ceux de Verdun;* Diéterlan, *Le Bois, le Prêtre;* Le Bail, *La Brigade des Jean Gouin;* Louis Thomas, *Les Diables bleus pendant la Guerre de Délivrance, 1914–1916;* Ch. Le Goffic, *Dixmude, un chapitre de l'histoire des fusiliers marins, 7 oct. au 10 nov. 1914;* H. Bordeaux, *Les derniers jours du Fort de Vaux* and *Prisonniers délivrés.*

A place by itself must be given to Marcel Berger, *Le Miracle du feu* (1916). There is a delicate love affair interwoven in the account of the first weeks of the war, but the main thing is a piece of very keen psychological analysis of a soldier's mind. But while Gaspard, Bourru de Vauquois, and the man of the squad of *Le Feu* are soldiers sprung from the plain people of France, Berger's soldier, a sergeant, belongs to the class of the intellectuals who, before the war, still adopted a skeptical, even cynical, view of things. Michel has a good position and need not exert himself, thus he leads a comfortable, uneventful, and self-centered life; he has banished emotion from

his existence as a disturbing element; he does not marry because of the burden that would be imposed upon him. When the war breaks out he joins his regiment reluctantly and because not doing so would be likely to cause him much more trouble than to do his duty; once in the army he is very anxious to avoid all unnecessary labor; he is friendly to his soldiers, and that is all. Gradually, however, he comes to realize that the plain man of the people is morally fully the equal, often the superior, of the man with the cultivated mind. He cannot help noticing and enjoying the beauty of human brotherhood as it is manifested in the war. He has a relapse into pessimism when left to his thoughts in the hospital, while recovering from a serious wound, but with the return of health a lofty optimism and faith in human nature finally win. If such a book does not appeal to the general public, as do the others mentioned, it is fully equal to any of them in keenness and conscientious workmanship.

Albert Schinz

Smith College

The Life of Lazarillo de Tormes and His Fortunes and Adversities. Done out of the Castilian from R. Foulché-Delbosc's restitution of the *Editio Princeps* by Louis How with an Introduction and Notes by Charles Philip Wagner. New York: Mitchell Kinnerley, 1917.

This book is an important contribution to *Lazarillo* studies. Mr. How's translation is far superior to any previous rendering of this text into English. It will supersede the versions of Rowland, Blakeston, Roscoe, and Sir Clements Markham. It is more accurate than any of these and no whit inferior in readableness and literary distinction. Professor Wagner has assembled in his introduction and notes all the important results of previous scholars, together with many valuable, original suggestions of his own.

Mr. How wisely chose as the basis for his translation Foulché-Delbosc's composite text, thereby avoiding the mistakes of Cejador and Bonilla, who in their recent texts of the *Lazarillo* attach undue importance to the Burgos and Antwerp texts respectively. Good as the translation is, it is not infallible. I suggest the following possible betterments. Page 5: Add the words "who went thither" after "knight." Page 7: Omission of the phrase *hazia perdidas*. Translate: "and he made away with the rugs and horse blankets." *Casa*, "house," means "religious establishment" in this context. Page 12: How translates *no me demediaua de lo necessario:* "didn't share even the necessaries with me." Better: "didn't give me half what I needed." Page 13: The difficult phrase *tan por contadero* is too freely rendered, "so well counted." Page 15: *Capuz* means here "gown" rather than "hood." Page 20: "Towns" rather than "places." "Would move away" is too weak. I suggest, "would take French leave." *Para echarlo*

en el fardel tornauase mosto, y lo que a el se llegaua is wrongly rendered, "if put into the sack, it would turn to must, and so we decided on this," etc. The last phrase is a complete misunderstanding. Better, "if put into the sack, it and whatever came close to it would turn to must." Page 24: "That I had to enjoy myself with." Read: "that I was to enjoy." Page 25: *Hallose en frio* does not mean, "he found himself chilled," but corresponds rather to the modern *estar* or *quedarse fresco*. The translator has sacrificed accuracy to maintain the pun. We might say in slang, "He found that he had received a cold deal in the form of the cold turnip." Page 26: Add "and substitution" after "exchange." "Wretched" rather than "black sausage." *Golosina* here means "tidbit" rather than "gluttony"; it refers literally to the sausage. Page 27: "That it abandoned its stolen goods." Better: "that the stolen goods hit it," i.e., the blind man's nose. Page 28: *Con* should be rendered "although" instead of "because." *Demanda* is a legal term and means "accusation" rather than "requests." Page 29: *Hombre* means "one," "anybody," not "man." Page 36: "Because I had nowhere to make him jump." Wrong. Better: "Because I had no means of attacking him." Page 37: "From him" instead of "from it." Page 38: "However it might be most to his service." Better: "However he might be most pleased." Page 41: "Miserly" rather than "miserable." Page 42: Omit "come." Page 45: "Are we placed by being born?" Read: "Are we mortals placed?" Translate *passar* by "suffer" or "endure" rather than by "change." Page 47: "Wretched" for "darksome." "Rendered keen" rather than "animated." Page 50: *Contino el gato estaua armado dentro del arca*, "the cat was continually on watch inside the chest." Read: "Straightway the trap was set inside the chest." Page 51: "Gown" rather than "clothes." Page 52: *Trasgo*, "goblin" rather than "ghost." Page 53: *Muy a menudo*, "frequently" rather than "very minute." Farther on an omission. Read: "so that my startled master heard it." Page 54: *Contaua el que se auia llegado a mi*, "he used to relate that he had come to me." This should be rendered: "he calculated that he had come up to me." Page 55: *He caçado* does not mean "I have been hunting," but means "I have caught." Page 56: *Con todo esto* means "nevertheless" not "meanwhile." *Demediar* means not "help" but "give (me) half enough." Page 58: *Andando assi discurriendo de puerta en puerta*, "I was wandering thus aimlessly from door to door." Better: "Thus reasoning as I walked from door to door." The meaning of *discurriendo* is determined by what precedes. Page 60: *Manga* means in this context "pouch" or "bag" not "sleeve." Page 61: "Fit for the public ear" not "appropriate." Page 63: "Those I had got in God's name." Better: "those I had got by begging." Page 66: "But now we shall have to do otherwise." Omit "have to." Page 69: "And he went down the street." Change "down" to "up." Why not follow Morel-Fatio's suggestion and change "Count of Arcos" to "Count of Claros"? Foulché-Delbosc does not do so, neither do Cejador and Bonilla, but the

point has been fully proved. Page 70: "Where I saw." Insert "in a garden" after "where." Page 79: *Pan* here has the old meaning "wheat" rather than "bread." Page 82: *A desora* is "suddenly," "unexpectedly," rather than "in an evil hour." Page 89: *Todavia passa su lazeria*, "then his indigence passes." Better: "he still suffers indigence." "To laugh at his pleasantries," etc. Throughout this passage the translator fails to recognize the divided conditional. Page 90: "To tell some trifles." Rather: "to give a few sharp spur-pricks." "Amusing things." Better: "accomplishments." Page 94: "For the love of God." Better: "For the sake of Charity." Page 96: "Monastery" rather than "convent." Page 103: *De su estado*, "full length" rather than "from his footing." Page 110: "To the scrivener and to the members of the council." Read: "to his scrivener and that of the council." Page 112: Read: "ten captives" instead of "two captives." Page 116: "I also underwent sufferings." Read: "I also underwent a tolerable number of sufferings." Page 122: Change "because" to "that." Much that I have here considered wrong may be due to a certain freedom which the translator has felt justified in employing for the sake of style. If I call attention to errors it is solely to make more useful his very serviceable book.

Mr. Wagner's contribution to the volume is even better. He gives us the best succinct summing up of the *Lazarillo* problems anywhere available and evinces unusual thoroughness and sagacity. The only important bibliographical omission is his failure to use Bonilla y San Martin's edition (Madrid, 1915). It appeared two years before Wagner's study, but possibly this was finished before the Bonilla edition became available. In his discussion of the dating of the *Lazarillo*, Wagner's argument seems more plausible than Bonilla's. And he has done far more than any of his predecessors toward reconstructing the folklore background underlying the first of the great picaresque novels. His merit is to have studied the *Lazarillo* from a European rather than from a narrowly Spanish viewpoint. As an example of Wagner's acuteness see page xxiii and note, where he proves that the allusion to the *Lazarillo* in Cristóbal de Villalón's *Crotalón* refers to the underlying folklore original, not to the anonymous *Segunda Parte*, as De Haan and Bonilla had supposed. He is less discerning, I think, when he follows authority in considering the unique passages of the Alcalá edition to be late interpolations. Did not these passages too belong to the lost original? See page 24 of the present work, immediately after the first long "interpolation," where the author of the *Lazarillo* writes: "But not to be prolix, I omit an account of many things, as funny as they are worthy of note, which befel me with this my first master," etc. In mediaeval and Renaissance manuscripts omissions from, and condensations of, the source are frequently indicated by such remarks as this. Furthermore the author of the alleged interpolation has also condensed his source. Further adventures at the inn with the "eating-house women and nougat-sellers, and prostitutes, and such

women-folk" are plainly promised but not supplied. There is also evident condensation in the short chapters toward the end. Some few at least of the "thousand ills" suffered in the service of the tambourine painter must have been described in the lost source. Otherwise it is difficult to account for the introduction of this personage.

Wagner has found no less than seven European versions of the "smell-the-post" story and promises an article on the subject. I prefer the term "the blind man's leap" rather than the former, because it does not seem to me that the post necessarily figures in the trick. Everybody is familiar with the quotation from *Much Ado about Nothing* in which Shakespeare betrays familiarity with the story. But so far as I know, no commentator, either upon Shakespeare or the *Lazarillo*, has ever pointed out the possible connection between the leap of Gloucester (*King Lear*, Act IV, scene vi) and that of the blind beggar in the *Lazarillo*. As early as 1754 a Mrs. Lennox indicated as the source of the Gloucester-Edgar-Edmund story *The Paphlagonian Unkind King*, an episodic story introduced by Sir Philip Sidney into Book II of his *Arcadia*. But in this story Shakespeare found only a suggestion for the trick played upon the blind man by his guide. The king, wishing to commit suicide, asks his guide to lead him to the top of a high rock. This, Leonatus, the dutiful son, simply refuses to do. Now Shakespeare, on reading the *Arcadia*, was struck by the resemblance between the fate of the Paphlagonian king and that of King Lear. Both had been betrayed by favorite children, and each was aided in his distress by a child previously treated with injustice and cruelty. Therefore he wove these two very similar stories into one. Is it not possible that the situation of the blind man and his guide, figuring in Sidney's tale, similarly suggested to Shakespeare the story of Lazarillo and his blind master? He may easily have read the Rowland translation of 1576; and if not directly familiar with the *Lazarillo* he at least knew some other version of "the blind man's leap" story, as the allusion in *Much Ado about Nothing* clearly proves: "Ho! now you strike like the blind man; 'twas the boy that stole your meat, and you'll beat the post" (Act II, scene i). Hunter long ago saw that the deception practiced upon Gloucester by Edgar had no parallel in Sidney. He considered that this feature of the sub-plot was an unhappy invention of Shakespeare's own.[1] Gloucester, desiring death as the only solution of his troubles, asks his guide to lead him to the edge of Dover cliff (suggested by the "high rock" of Sidney's tale). Gloucester—and here we have a notable departure from Sidney—is unaware that his guide is his son; for Edgar has assumed the rôle of a mad beggar, Tom of Bedlam. Edgar, instead of complying with his father's wishes or openingly refusing, as in Sidney, leads the blind man to an open field and urges him to jump. He does so and falls prone. Edgar then lifts up the old man, assumes a different voice, reveals his identity, and

[1] Hunter, *New Illustrations*, London, 1845, II, p. 273. Quoted by Furness, *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare, King Lear*. Eleventh Edition, Philadelphia, n. d.

makes his father believe that the latter has actually taken the leap and that his life has been preserved by a miracle. As in the *Lazarillo* we have a blind man deceived by his leader into taking a leap wholly different from the one he proposes. Here the resemblance ends. In the one case the deceit is prompted by malice; the injury, even the death, of the blind man is sought. In the other the imposture is inspired by filial piety, and the aim is to bring the blind man out of his despair by means of a pious fraud. This episode may represent a union of Sidney's story with the "blind man's leap" story; but of course this is speculation difficult of proof. I merely offer this as a suggestion to Professor Wagner for use in the comparative study of the story which he has promised.

George T. Northup

University of Chicago

Comedia Famosa de Las Burlas Veras de Ivlian de Armendariz. Edited by S. I. Millard Rosenberg, Philadelphia, 1917. Pp. 206. Publications of the University of Pennsylvania. Department of Romanic Languages and Literatures.

The ideal dissertation should open fields for farther investigation, and it is always a pleasure to see new fruits resulting from an old study. Mr. Rosenberg, after publishing as his dissertation *La Española de Florencia o Burlas y Amor Invencionero*, has given proof of continued zeal by making accessible two other equally important works whose similarity of title had led bibliographers into hopeless confusion. The second of these was *Las Burlas Veras* of Lope de Vega; the third, with which we are now concerned is a play of the same title by Julian de Armendariz. Its chief interest lies in the fact that it is the sole surviving play of one of Spain's minor dramatists, of whose work we had hitherto known little. The play itself is mediocre; it interests principally for its vivid scenes of student life.

In the first three chapters of his introduction, R. discusses the whole cycle of plays, repeating much that he had said in previous studies. The facsimiles in this volume had also been printed previously. One sees at once that R. still clings to his more than doubtful theory that Calderón wrote *La Española de Florencia*, in spite of A. L. Stiefel's arguments to the contrary. All will agree that the absence of a title in the Veragua list is no proof that Calderón did not write a given play. But in this case Calderón has expressly denied the authorship. A heavy burden of proof rests upon one who would father this foundling upon an author who denies its parentage, and R. offers nothing but subjective impressions, and similarities of style. Many after reading the play are equally confident that Calderón did not write it. The situation is the same as regards *La tía fingida*. Many scholars think they detect in this story undoubted traces of Cervantes' style; others are equally confident that the master never wrote a line of it. Now it may well be doubted if the authorship of any work can be determined on the basis of

style alone. *La Española de Florencia* is still of doubtful authorship. Stiefel, too, has not proved his case for Lope, though his argument is the more plausible of the two. The high authority of Morf, who sides with R., does not decide the question.

Chapter IV contains a brief biography of Armendariz, the best available. Other chapters discuss the play now edited. The weakest part of the study is the text itself, which has been edited with an absolute lack of critical method. On p. 167 the editor lists a number of words (*sigun, siguro, sigundo, quesiera, elusion, piadad,* etc.) which he terms "curious misspellings," thereby betraying a curious ignorance of Spanish dialects. He should have made a detailed study to solve the question whether these are Leonisms, such as a Salmantino like his author would have been likely to use, or whether they are dialect forms due to the scribe of the Parma MS here reproduced. In the poem, *El Patron Salmantino,* reprinted in the appendix, Armendariz writes pure Castilian. If R. had consistently substituted Castilian forms for dialect, such a method might be defended. Yet it seems safer to reproduce carefully the MS, correcting errors. This R. pretends to do: "The orthography of the MS has been scrupulously preserved, except that the punctuation has been modernized and that homonyms, interrogative pronouns, and the future and past definite tenses of verbs have been accented." (p. 61). But neither this system nor any other discoverable one has been consistently adhered to. Comparing text with the one page of facsimile, we find that *beras* is twice printed as *veras* (in the case of many other words with initial *b* the change has not been made) and *quesiera, quisiera.* One wonders how much more modernization there has been without indication in the footnotes. Dialect forms are often retained in the text, even when considered misspellings, and quite as often relegated to the footnotes. The clearly erroneous form *escribó* for *escribió* is retained, the very common *siguro* rejected. Sometimes the same form is treated differently at different times. Thus the MS reading *escuro* is retained (verse 1252) and changed to *oscuro* (verse 1426). A more complete lack of system is hardly to be conceived of.

The editor also makes mistakes of scansion. Verse 995 reads: *a que te siente[s] a su mesa.* The addition of the *s* destroys both sense and meter. The line: *o tortearéle la cara* is not wrong. The verb is a coinage which should give no difficulty. Syneresis of *ea* is common in other verses. But how about R's proposed emendation: *o torturaréle la cara?* Here there is one syllable too many. The following errors have also caught my attention: 499, read *hablado* for *hallado,* as the sense demands. Make the following two lines a question. 600, the phrase *Peor está que estaba* is a common expression. It is not necessary to suppose with R. that its use here implies the existence of a play by that title antedating this play and Calderón's well-known comedy, even though it does seem certain that Luis Alvarez wrote a like-titled play previous to the work of Calderón. See Schmidt (Schauspiele Calderón's, pp. 31 ff.). 659, the change of *lo* to *le* is unnecessary and wrong. 682, wrong: the MS reading is correct. 1163, *quel ruydo* [*a*] *ya pasado,* the

"*vocal embebida*" *a* should be placed after *ya*, not before it. 1255, *pues yo entro*. *Ve seguro*, change *ve* to *vete*, as suggested in the note. The hiatus is unlikely. 1564–5, make these lines a question. 1802, *¡Santo, en gracia! ¡Santa Ynes!* Nonsense. Read: *Santa Engracia*, etc. 1934, *obligado* is a misprint for *obligada*. 2106, emendation wrong. Retain the MS reading. 2226, note, *esbribió*, a misprint. 2299, retain *estella*. 2482, *dará dichoso fin*, etc. *Dará* is an emendation for *dire* of the MS. Read rather *diere:* the context demands a subjunctive. 2645 and 2652, retain the MS readings.

It would be unfair to convey the impression that R. has not made some good emendations. There is also much of value in the notes, even if these are often too elementary in character. Scholars, to whom alone the volume is addressed, do not need to be informed that *diabro-diablo*, *ynorancia-ignorancia*, *bergudo-verdugo*, etc. The literary portion of the present study is far superior to the linguistic.

GEORGE T. NORTHUP

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Les Œuvres de Guiot de Provins, poète lyrique et satirique. Editées par JOHN ORR. Pp. lv+206. Manchester: Imprimerie de l'Université, 1915.

This is an excellent edition of the complete works of a French poet of the time of Philippe Auguste, a poet who, after attempting a career as professional singer in the seigneurial courts, turned monk, first at Clairvaux and then at Cluny, and who, moreover, saw something of life in Palestine during the Third Crusade. The works consist of five chansons, the *Bible*, which falls into two distinct parts, and a short religious meditation formerly published as a *Suite* to the *Bible*, but now more accurately entitled *L'Armeüre du Chevalier*.

One-fifth of Guiot's *Bible* (the word seems to be used in the sense of "epitome of wisdom") is a lengthy lamentation upon the decadence of the French nobility from such as the author knew it in his youth: an interesting list of 86 of his supposed benefactors is passed in review, patrons renowned for prowess and generosity, kings, dukes, and lesser notables, "the like of whom the world will never see again." Under Philippe Auguste, and largely as a result of the two crusades, the social order was evidently changing; the monarchy was growing rapidly at the expense of the provincial courts; centers of culture like those for which Crestien de Troyes had written had entered upon a decline, the prestige of the University at Paris meantime increasing the influence of the national capital. Guiot, discouraged by the prevailing "avarice" and the decadence of patronage, had no choice but to go into a monastery. Here, however, he was no better off, and the remaining four-fifths of the *Bible* is a lively satire on the regular clergy, with some attention at the end to the foibles of theologians, lawyers, and doctors.

The work of editing the *Bible* from two rather poor manuscripts has been done with care; Mr. Orr had the advantage of the advice of Professors

A. Thomas and A. Jeanroy, and the result is to be accepted as a definitive edition, unless other sources or materials (there are mentions of four manuscripts which have been lost) should come to light. A thorough study has been made of the language of Guiot, the variants are given with the greatest care, and there is no disposition to evade difficulties. Only a few suggestions can find place here. *Bible* 42: *aovrir* is well attested for both Crestien and Marie de France (*Espg.* 29, *Eliduc* 653, although wanting in Warnke's glossary to the *Fables*). 131: The change of *cui* to *cuit* is unnecessary, as there seem to have been two forms of the verb, *cuier* and *cuidier*, both, by the way, in the *Roland*. 687: The reading of the MS, rejected by Mr. Orr, seems to me unobjectionable: *Oïl, j'oi dire qu'il i part*, "Yes, I hear it said that he [the Pope] shares in it [gets his share]." For *partir* in this sense, cf. *li rois devoit partir à son chatel* (*La Male Honte*, 8–9): here the king would take a part of the property upon the death of the owner. 2667: To the note on page 151 upon *mâchefer* might be added that Mosemiller (*ML Notes*, XX, 248) has almost certainly hit upon the correct explanation of this word: Franche-Comté dialectal *merde* (*de*) *fer*=SCORIA FERRI.

It is well known that San Marte edited the *Bible* upon the presupposition of the identity of Guiot with the famous Kyot of Wolfram's *Parzival*. Mr. Orr's labors throw no new light upon this problem, except perhaps in making clearer the fact that Guiot in his younger days studied in Provence and learned there the art of the *trobadors*. The editor states (note, p. xii): "Je n'essaye pas de résoudre le difficile problème des sources de Wolfram. Mais, les rapports de notre poète avec la Provence étant assurés, ne faudrait-il pas en tenir compte si, un jour, on s'avise à revenir sur cette identification?" The question, then, remains open.

Two other aspects of this publication seem quite noteworthy. While Guiot was of Provins, a town at no great distance from Paris, and wrote in a language which the editor would class as a pure French (following here, no doubt, the tradition of G. Paris, who always minimized somewhat the Champenois elements in Crestien), no effort has been made to furnish a "restored" or "normalized" text, such as we have in Foerster's editions of Crestien, especially the earlier ones. Most of the work of the Lorraine copyist has been allowed to stand, bizarre as it sometimes is and difficult to read. But this is surely wise, not only in this case but in others; the reaction against a rigorously consistent orthography is also to be favored.

If we mistake not, this edition, which inaugurates happily the "French Series" of the University of Manchester, is the first Old French text published in England having no immediate bearing upon English history. There have been some such texts published in the columns of the *Modern Language Quarterly* and the *Modern Language Review*, and perhaps elsewhere, but none, I believe, of this importance nor any edited with this degree of thoroughness or this wealth of illustrative commentary.

T. A. JENKINS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

57

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVI — *December 1918* — NUMBER 8

LE TRANSCENDANTALISME D'APRÈS L'HISTOIRE

Qu'est-ce que le Transcendantalisme? A cette question un ouvrage récent examiné ici-même[1] faisait la réponse suivante. Le Transcendantalisme est un mouvement essentiellement religieux de sa nature. C'est bien moins une philosophie qu'un nouveau système d'apologétique chrétienne sous l'égide de Victor Cousin. Ce n'est pas Emerson, c'est Channing et Ripley qui sont "l'âme" du Transcendantalisme. Le Transcendantalisme avait trouvé sa forme définitive et originale avant 1835, c'est à dire avant les premiers travaux d'Emerson. C'est à tort que l'on rapporte à Kant un mouvement surtout français dans son origine. Sur ce mouvement Coleridge ni Carlyle n'ont eu d'influence marquée.

Telles sont les thèses que nous voudrions discuter. Nous ne leur opposerons point des raisonnements ni des hypothèses plus ou moins vérifiées par les textes mais une enquête critique dans les périodiques et les ouvrages de controverse de l'époque, enquête dont nous donnons ici les principaux résultats.

LE TRANSCENDANTALISME ET SA DEFINITION

Tout se passe dans les textes nombreux que nous avons examinés comme si le Transcendantalisme était un changement de philosophie, le passage du sensualisme à l'idéalisme qu'Emerson signalait dans

[1] *Du Transcendantalisme considéré essentiellement dans sa definition et ses origines françaises*, par W. Girard. Voir dans *Modern Philology*, September, 1917, le compte-rendu de M. Sherburn.

son essai fameux sur le Transcendantaliste. Le problème religieux et le problème philosophique, il est vrai, sont inséparables dans l'histoire du mouvement, mais, de ces deux éléments, il n'est pas douteux non plus que c'est non la religiosité mais la philosophie qui est nouvelle. La théorie de la divine immanence dont M. Girard fait l'essence du Transcendantalisme est ancienne. On la trouve chez Edwards et les mystiques puritains et autres. Ce n'est pas en tant que religion mais en tant que philosophie que le Transcendantalisme est une innovation. C'est ce que constataient déjà les historiens comme Frothingham dans un passage tronqué par M. Girard.[1]

Que, dès le début du 19ème siècle, on sente en Amérique le besoin de donner à la religiosité une base philosophique nouvelle, rien de plus certain. On s'aperçoit, non sans raison, que l'alliance du sentiment religieux avec une philosophie sensualiste de son essence, comme celle de Locke, est contre nature: "Notre religion et notre philosophie sont en guerre," écrit Brownson en 1836. "Tout le monde le sait, nous ne sommes plus religieux qu'aux dépens de la logique."[2] Cette contradiction doit cesser. Il y a des besoins nouveaux que n'explique ni ne satisfait plus le système de Locke. On demande à une philosophie nouvelle de prouver la religion et cette philosophie qui manque en Amérique on la cherche à l'étranger, en Angleterre, en France, mais surtout en Allemagne.

Sur ces aspirations et besoins nouveaux tout le monde est d'accord mais on va différer sur le choix à faire d'une philosophie; c'est à ce sujet que la controverse s'engage et qu'Unitaires et Transcendantaux sont aux prises.[3] Aux besoins nouveaux on oppose "l'aridité et la froideur" de la prédication contemporaine. Cela tient à la théologie du temps "taught to consider mere ratiocination as the grand and almost sole function of the human mind." "A winter reigned in the theology of the land second only to that of the scholastic age." "The system runs counter to nature . . . . the heart will throb forth its

[1] Frothingham écrit bien: "Transcendentalism . . . . had none but a religious aspect," mais il ajoute—phrase oubliée par M. Girard dans sa citation—"*such an inference would be narrow*" (*Transcendentalism in New England*, p. 128 et non 53).

[2] *Christian Examiner*, XXI, 33 ff.

[3] "There are certain periods in the history of society, when, passing from a state of spontaneous production to a state of reflection, mankind are particularly disposed to inquire concerning themselves and their destination, the nature of their being, the evidence of their knowledge, and the grounds of their faith." C'est ce qui se passe actuellement en Allemagne et qui se voit dans l'œuvre de Kant (*Ch. Exam.*, XIV [1833], 120).

innate tendency, and conscience will assert its prerogative." Voilà pourquoi on va à la philosophie française et allemande.[1]

Si les Transcendantaux sont d'instinct des novateurs, leurs adversaires restent des gens d'autorité et de froide raison. De là des résistances et des controverses au cours des quelles les points de vue réciproques vont de plus en plus diverger, au point d'en devenir contradictoires. Le Transcendantalisme va naître de ce conflit. Forme et fond les adversaires vont le déclarer inacceptable. Qu'il s'agisse de "la formidable terminologie de Kant" ou des "grâces de Platon" on ne voit dans l'idéalisme nouveau qu' "un tissu d'absurdités," "a mass of palpable absurdities."[2] On n'a pas assez de mots pour exprimer son indignation envers ce "charlatanisme," "which tampers with religious belief and immortal interests, in order to gild and complete a fantastic system of man's device."[3] C'étaient les poètes qui élaboraient la religion des anciens. Ce sont les philosophes qui prétendent établir celle des modernes. On ne leur reconnaît pas ce droit: "Philosophy is not the master nor the author of religion, but its servant. It may interpret oracles, but it utters none."[4]

On tourne en ridicule "the poetical school of philosophy," "illud alterum genus philosophiae phantasticum, et tumidum, et quasi poeticum, magis blanditum intellectui." Tout ce qui est métaphysique, mystique et poésie est déclaré a priori obscur et inintelligible.[5] Tel est le verdict que l'on applique indistinctement à Kant,

[1] *Two Articles of the Princeton Review, concerning the transcendental philosophy*, pp. 6–8.

La même constatation fait l'objet du chapitre I du livre de John Murdock, *Sketches of Modern Philosophy* (1842), où Murdock ramène très justement l'histoire du Transcendantalisme au conflit entre l'entendement au sens de Locke et la raison au sens de Cousin et de Kant.—"Your philosophy has so benumbed your spiritual nature, that you can not even talk upon this subject" ("A Plain Discussion with a Transcendentalist," *New Englander*, I [1843], 506). Tout ce dialogue entre un Transcendantaliste et son adversaire est à lire. Le Transcendantaliste y soutient ce point de vue que: "the understanding is not adapted to the discovery of truth in things spiritual." Même idée dans une contribution fort intéressante: *An Essay on Transcendentalism* (Boston: Crocker and Ruggles, 1842, p. 27)—"It is based on principles which show our old philosophy to be false and hollow." "A religious community has reason to look with distrust and dread on a philosophy which limits the ideas of the human mind to the informations of the senses and denies the existence of spiritual elements in the nature of man." D'où nécessité d'accorder la religion avec une philosophie nouvelle, telle qu'on la trouve en Angleterre, en Allemagne et en France (*Dial*, I, 259–60).

[2] *North Am. Rev.* (July, 1829), *pass.* et pp. 110, 111, 116.

[3] *Ch. Exam.*, XXIV, 327–28.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] *Ibid.*, XIV, 117: "Whatever is *supersensual* and cannot be made plain by images addressed to the senses is denounced as obscure, or beckoned away as mystical and extravagant. Whatever lies beyond the limits of ordinary and outward experience is regarded as the ancient geographers regarded the greater portion of the globe—as a land of shadows and chimaeras."

Swedenborg, Cousin, Coleridge, Carlyle et Emerson. Le pli est pris: Transcendantalisme est désormais synonyme d'inintelligible, absurde et obscur, autrement dit métaphysique, mystique, poétique et allemand. Il est entendu que "precise and correct thoughts commonly clothe themselves in simple, accurate, and intelligible language."[1] On soutient que le domaine de l'expérience est seul celui de la philosophie, qu'il y a des problèmes que la raison humaine n'a pas qualité pour résoudre et qui sont du ressort exclusif de la religion.[2] On ne sort pas de là. Les Transcendantaux auront bien de la peine à se défaire de ce reproche. Ils auront beau montrer que la philosophie et la religion sont parfaitement compatibles, que poétique et mystique ne sont pas nécessairement synonymes d'obscur. Ils ne seront pas suivis. La lutte est désormais engagée entre "sensualistes" et "supernaturalistes," entre "empiristes" et "métaphysiciens," disciples de Locke et de Bacon d'une part et partisans de l'idéalisme allemand ou français de l'autre. Deux écoles philosophiques sont désormais en présence et les positions qu'elles défendent sont déclarées antithétiques. Ce sont deux états d'esprit différents et contradictoires, l'un est lockien, l'autre transcendantal. D'un camp à l'autre on ne parle pas la même langue.[3]

DATE D'APPARITION DU TRANSCENDANTALISME

Le Transcendantalisme est un idéalisme nouveau qui devient de notoriété publique vers 1836.[4] C'est ce dont témoignent les documents dont nous faisons usage:[5]

[1] *North Am. Rev.* (July, 1829), *pass.* et p. 111.

[2] *Ch. Exam.*, XXIII, 194: "There are mysteries in nature, which human power cannot penetrate; there are problems which the philosopher cannot solve." Voir tout cet article qui nous donne du Transcendantalisme un signalement fort complet.

[3] *Ch. Exam.*, XXIV, 322–23: "We find no other distinction so broad and obvious, as the one . . . . between the writings of Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, and Cousin on the one side, and those of Locke, Reid, and their followers on the other." *Ibid.*, XXIII, 174 ff.: "Certainly it is that a revolution in taste and opinion is going on among our literary men, and that philosophical writing is assuming a phasis entirely new. . . . . The difference between the old and new schools is radical." Le Transcendantalisme est une philosophie nouvelle, "new in the facts with which it starts, new in the course of inquiry, in the end which it proposes, in matter, method, and results." *An Essay on Transcendentalism*, p. 20. Cf. également Murdock, *op. cit.*, chap. i.

[4] Rappelons que c'est en 1835 qu'Emerson confie à Carlyle le projet d'une revue, "The Transcendentalist," première idée du *Dial.—Carlyle-Emerson Correspondence*, I, 48. Les premières réunions du "Transcendental Club" sont de septembre 1836.

[5] Les italiques sont nôtres.

"*Within a short period of time* a new school of philosophy has appeared."—*Ch. Exam.*, XXI (January, 1837), 377. (Compte-rendu de *Nature* d'Emerson.)

"*Transcendentalism as it is beginning to be manifested among ourselves.*"—*Ibid.*, XXI (May, 1837), 187.

"Certainly it is that *a revolution . . . . is going on* among our literary men."—*Ibid.*, XXIII (November 1837).

"This timid procedure [la méthode de Locke] *has become unpopular of late.* A new set of philosophers has arisen."—*Ibid.*, XXIV (March, 1838), 322.

"We would call a public attention to this address as *the first fruits of transcendentalism in our country.*"—Norton: *Transcendentalism*, p. 69. (L'adresse en question est la *Divinity School Address* d'Emerson. Juillet 1838.)

"*It has for some time been pretty generally admitted . . . .* that there is in the midst of us . . . . a monster. . . . . To this was given the—as the thing was new—new name, Transcendentalism."—*An Essay on Transcendentalism* (1842), pp. 7–8.

"Transcendentalism is *now* the chosen current epithet."—*Dial*, III (January, 1843), 407.

LE TRANSCENDANTALISME ET SON REPRÉSENTANT

Qu'Emerson soit au moment où paraissent les documents ci-dessus et, de leur propre aveu, considéré par ses contemporains comme le représentant typique et l'on peut dire officiel du mouvement, nul doute. Entre 1836 et 1840, au moment où le Transcendantalisme s'impose à l'attention publique comme un mouvement philosophique nouveau et où l'on commence à l'attaquer comme tel, c'est bien Emerson qui le représente. C'est à propos de *Nature*, des premières conférences de Boston, et du fameux discours devant la faculté de théologie de Cambridge que la controverse transcendantaliste bat son plein. C'est Emerson qui fournit aux adversaires la première occasion de définir le mouvement. Nommément ou non, c'est bien lui que l'on prend pour le Transcendantaliste typique et, à en croire ses adversaires, le Transcendantaliste unique. En quoi faisant les adversaires sentent très bien d'ailleurs que la tactique est dangereuse. On craint, en désignant Emerson comme le chef du mouvement, de lui faire, comme nous disons aujourd'hui, une réclame et de le désigner ainsi à l'attention de disciples éventuels. C'est pourquoi, sans souci des contradictions, on voit tantôt en Emerson le Transcendantaliste

par excellence, un maître entouré de partisans, tantôt au contraire un isolé qui ne saurait faire école et qui séduit les jeunes gens par le caractère brillant et poétique de sa rhétorique. Mais enfin Emerson fait parler de lui et on l'écoute. On a beau faire des réserves là-dessus pour rassurer le public. On ne voit pas moins dans Emerson le *leader* des Transcendantaux.

Telle est l'attitude adoptée, entre autres, par le *Christian Examiner* pour atténuer les craintes de Norton au sujet du Discours de Cambridge:[1]

We know of but one single individual whom the public has any sufficient ground for regarding as a believer of it. From the published writings of Mr. Emerson, quoted by the reviewers, and their accordance with the language quoted from the German philosophers, it may with great apparent certainty be inferred that he is of their school; and *beside him there are a few others*, who, if not to be termed followers, yet hold generally with him.

Mais de ce que l'on admire Emerson comme conférencier il ne faut pas en conclure qu'on lui reconnaisse une autorité quelconque en philosophie ou en religion, ajoute-t-on. Quel est celui de ses auditeurs qui pourrait dire, au sortir de ses conférences, si Emerson est "théiste, panthéiste, ou athée"? Emerson est un brillant orateur, un poète mais il n'a pas de système: "Those lectures were brilliant flights of the imagination, beautiful streams of poetry . . . . but they are not clear expositions of doctrine, or systematic statements of opinion." Emerson est un disciple des Allemands, il est plus poète que philosophe et voilà pourquoi il est transcendantal.[2]

LE TRANSCENDANTALISME ET L'IDÉALISME ALLEMAND

Sur les rapports étroits qui existent entre le Transcendantalisme américain et l'idéalisme allemand l'unanimité est non moins complète.[3] Des deux philosophies en présence l'une est anglaise et

[1] *Ch. Exam.*, XXVIII, 388 ff.

[2] On connaît le verdict de J. Q. Adams au sujet d'Emerson: "A young man named R. W. Emerson . . . . starts a new doctrine of Transcendentalism, declares all the old revelations superannuated and worn out, and announces the approach of new revelations and prophecies" (cit. Cabot, *Memoir of R. W. Emerson*, p. 410). On voit que l'erreur, si erreur il y a, qui fait d'Emerson le chef du Transcendantalisme est ancienne.

[3] A ce sujet l'attitude de M. Girard est la suivante. Il ne nie pas que l'idéalisme allemand n'ait exercé une certaine influence sur les Transcendantaux mais cette influence ne s'est fait sentir que sur "les unitaires rationalistes" qui ne sont pas selon lui les véritables Transcendantaux. En tout cas Kant n'a eu aucune influence sur le Transcendantalisme sous sa forme "essentiellement religieuse," ce qui nous paraît peu exact comme on le verra par la suite, au sujet de Coleridge surtout.

lockienne, l'autre allemande et kantienne. Le Transcendantalisme est le conflit de ces deux philosophies et le conflit est ancien. On a beau ne pas lire les philosophes allemands dans l'original et les déclarer obscurs, voire inintelligibles, leur influence, déclare-t-on, se fait partout sentir. Que, de fort bonne heure, les deux courants de pensée, allemand et américain, se rencontrent et se confondent sur le plan philosophique, nul doute. C'est ce qu'indique le collaborateur de la *North American Review* dans son histoire des systèmes idéalistes avant Cousin: "We allude . . . . to the Transcendental philosophy founded by the celebrated Kant, a professor at the University of Koenigsberg in Prussia."[1]

C'est à lui que les adversaires de Locke en Amérique prennent la théorie des idées innées (qui est fausse), et l'idéalisme nouveau qui est absurde mais dont le succès s'explique par l'âme de vérité qu'il contient et qui consiste à mettre en évidence: "The independent and substantial existence of our thinking part, 'the God within the mind.'" Le spiritualisme nouveau est d'origine allemande: "Its foundations were first actually laid bare by the strong thinkers in Germany, a source from which has emanated more of the intellectual light on the subjects of philosophical inquiry than most writers in our language have yet been ready to acknowledge."[2] L'auteur de cet article—G. Ripley—se réjouit de voir les spiritualistes français suivre la même voie.

Ce n'est que par ignorance que l'on accuse les philosophes transcendantaux d'obscurité.[3] Pour les comprendre il faut se placer à leur point de vue: celui de la conscience intime. Les disciples de Kant écrivent pour ceux qui cherchent "with faith and hope a solution of questions which relate to spirit and form, substance and life, free will and fate, God and eternity."

Ces grandes questions qui préoccupent notre époque de réflexion, Kant et ses disciples les posent d'un point de vue tout nouveau. Au lieu de faire dépendre de la nature du monde extérieur nos intuitions, c'est de la nature de nos intuitions qu'ils font dépendre le monde. "We have here the key to the whole critical philosophy." Deux systèmes de philosophie sont en présence, "the one beginning with

[1] *North Am. Rev.*, XXIX (1829), 103, 117.
[2] *Ch. Exam.*, IX (1830), 70.
[3] *Ibid.*, XIV (1833), 108 ff.

nature and proceeding upward to intelligence, the other beginning with intelligence and ending in nature. The first is natural philosophy, the second transcendental philosophy." La prééminence intellectuelle de l'Allemagne en science, histoire, poésie est due à l'influence de sa philosophie et à l'emploi de la méthode transcendantale. Cette influence salutaire s'est fait sentir surtout ("most conspicuously") en théologie mais aussi "in every department of intellectual exertion": "A philosophy which has given such an impulse to mental culture and . . . . which has done so much to establish and to extend the spiritual in man and the ideal in nature, needs no apology; it commends itself by its fruits."[1] C'est tout l'acquis de nos connaissances que la philosophie nouvelle met en question.[2] Elle prétend supplanter l'ancienne mais n'offre rien de satisfaisant pour la remplacer. L'arrogance des novateurs suffit pour condamner leur doctrine. "There is prima facie evidence against it. It is abstruse in its dogmas, fantastic in its dress, and foreign in its origin. It comes from Germany." La philosophie allemande a tout envahi: "Poetry, theology, philosophy, all have been infected." L'Allemagne est pour les novateurs le foyer de la vie et de l'activité religieuse: "The religious speculations of the Germans are closely connected with their philosophical opinions, if indeed they do not proceed entirely from this fountain." D'une philosophie à l'autre les différences sont radicales: "Either one party or the other is entirely wrong." Quant à l'auteur de cette étude son siège est fait. Le dernier mot de la philosophie est dans Bacon et dans Locke qui ont fixé les limites de la raison.[3]

Kant est inintelligible.[4] Il écrit en hiéroglyphes. Il est intraduisible, sauf en grec. Il cultive l'obscur pour l'obscur. Mais il ne suffit pas de le condamner. Son influence est illimitée ("well-nigh unbounded"): "As his theory extended over the whole territory of knowledge, almost every science has in turn been infected with the wild and crude imagining of his followers."

[1] Ce n'est qu'en isolant la première partie de ce passage de son contexte que M. Girard peut faire de cette citation une condamnation du kantisme et bien à tort comme la suite le prouve. Cf. Girard, p. 411.

[2] *Ch. Exam.*, XXIII (1837), 174 ff.

[3] Voir du même auteur un compte-rendu de *Nature* par Emerson. *Ibid.*, XXI, 371 ff.: "Transcendental philosophy took its rise in Germany" et ses doléances à ce sujet.

[4] *North Am. Rev.* (July, 1839), pp. 44 ff.

Et ce n'est pas sans raison que, sous le couvert du kantisme, le radicalisme de Kant fait prendre en méfiance toute philosophie et que l'on regarde ce système "as a mere cover for an attack on all the principles of government and social order, and a philosophical religion as atheism itself."[1]

Dans la brochure que Norton édite en 1840, sous le titre de *Transcendantalisme*, tous ces reproches sont repris. Norton et les collaborateurs de la *Princeton Review* confondent dans le même anathème et le même reproche de panthéisme et d'athéisme les philosophes allemands, leurs disciples et vulgarisateurs, y compris Coleridge, Cousin, Carlyle, et Emerson. Allemands, français, anglais, ou américains, tous ces systèmes "are districts of the same kingdom; alike in arrogance, in nonsense and impiety."

Pour le prouver d'ailleurs, et quelque partiaux et prévenus qu'ils soient contre les novateurs, Norton et les collaborateurs de la *Princeton Review* renvoient aux textes originaux. Ils connaissent fort bien Kant, Hegel, Schelling, et Cousin. Les citations sont nombreuses. Ils établissent même un rapprochement original et juste entre le Transcendantalisme européen et américain et les philosophies orientales. Cette brochure, malgré son ton agressif, est un fort bon résumé de philosophie transcendantale.

A l'époque où nous sommes le cas est jugé. L'origine allemande et kantienne du Transcendantalisme américain est devenue un lieu commun des controverses en cours à ce sujet.

Que les Transcendantalistes aient accepté l'étiquette kantienne, la fait est non moins certain. Ils ne suivent pas Kant à toutes les étapes de sa critique, bien s'en faut, mais quand il s'agit d'opposer au sensualisme de Locke l'existence d'un ordre supérieur et, à proprement parler, *transcendantal* de certitude, ils sont kantiens. C'est à Kant qu'ils empruntent à cet effet leur théorie de la connaissance. Désireux de défendre leur idéalisme, ils ne manquent pas d'utiliser l'arme la plus forte et la plus précise qu'on ait jamais forgée contre

[1] L'essai déjà cité sur le Transcendantalisme justifierait les craintes de l'auteur: "It is hostile to the old systems and subversive of them. It is based on principles which show . . . . our religion but an empty show . . . . that the old forms of government have no foundation in reason," etc. (*An Essay on Transcendentalism*, pp. 27–28). L'auteur est un fervent Transcendantaliste.

les sensualistes et les sceptiques, c'est à dire les distinctions et la nomenclature de la *Critique* kantienne.

C'est ce dont Emerson et Theodore Parker en particulier ont été parfaitement avertis. "Placé mieux que personne," selon les propres paroles de M. Girard, "pour étudier le Transcendantalisme," Emerson est positif à cet égard dans un passage bien connu: "It is well known . . . . that the Idealism of the present day acquired the name of Transcendental from the use of that term by Immanuel Kant," etc. (*Works*, I, 339–40).

Parker, que M. Girard cite erronément (p. 422, n. 6) est du même avis. Parker a repris plusieurs fois après Emerson l'éloge de Kant. Sans doute, déclare Parker dans le *Dial*,[1] est-il plus aisé de lire les œuvres complètes de Scott que la *Critique* de Kant. Mais—c'est ce mais que M. Girard supprime dans sa citation: "Ses pensées [de Kant] sont des révolutions, ses livres des batailles."

Parker n'a pas la superstition de l'Allemagne, mais s'il est vrai que la philosophie se meurt en Angleterre et en Amérique, pourquoi ne pas en chercher en Allemagne la résurrection? Kant est le fondateur de la philosophie moderne. Parker trouvait la "brillante mosaïque" de Cousin peu satisfaisante et il s'adressait à Kant "one of the profoundest thinkers in the world, though one of the worst writers, even of Germany."[2] A défaut de conclusions, Kant procurait à Parker la vraie méthode et le mettait sur "la droite voie." Parker lui devait "les grandes intuitions primordiales de la nature humaine," sur lesquelles il fondait sa philosophie de la religion.

COLERIDGE ET LE TRANSCENDANTALISME

Quand on reprochait aux Transcendantaux l'origine allemande et surtout kantienne de leur doctrine, c'était sur un point très précis que l'on faisait porter le débat. Il faut bien justifier ce qu'on innove

[1] *Dial*, I, 320 ff.; IV, 408.

[2] Goddard, *Studies in New England Transcendentalism*, pp. 88–89. Faisant œuvre ici uniquement d'historien nous ne discuterons pas dans quelle mesure le Transcendantalisme américain et kantien se ressemblent et diffèrent au sens philosophique du mot. Les premiers critiques et historiens du Transcendantalisme, tel Murdock, n'ont pas manqué de faire des réserves à ce sujet. La Transcendance au sens de Kant est bien loin d'être exactement ce que l'entendent Coleridge et Cousin. Comment, en particulier, les vues de ces deux penseurs se sont substituées bien des fois à celles de Kant dans la synthèse transcendantaliste, ce serait à la critique philosophique de le montrer. Voir à ce sujet W. Riley, *American Thought*, 235 ff.

et, si peu systématique que l'on soit, pour passer de la connaissance rationnelle comme l'entendait Locke, à la connaissance intuitive, les Transcendantaux avaient besoin d'une théorie de la connaissance et des facultés. C'est cette théorie qu'ils ont empruntée à Coleridge. Nous ne referons pas l'histoire de la distinction entre *l'Entendement et la Raison* (Understanding and Reason). Mais nous croyons, avec les critiques du mouvement et les Transcendantaux eux-mêmes, qu'elle constitue le centre du débat et que l'histoire du Transcendantalisme tourne autour d'elle.[1] On sait la fortune que devait faire cette distinction empruntée à Kant et vulgarisée par Coleridge et Carlyle, reprise surtout par Emerson. Emerson voyait en elle "the key to all theology and a theory of human life" (*Journals*, III, 237). Que cette distinction contînt en elle-même tout un programme de renaissance religieuse, philosophique et littéraire aussi bien que de réforme sociale, Emerson l'a prouvé en en faisant le fondement de ses premières adresses et de son livre sur la *Nature*. La distinction de Coleridge fut pour lui une véritable révélation.

A la faculté discursive condamnée à évoluer dans le champ étroit de l'expérience et à mesurer strictement l'étendue de ses découvertes à celle du monde sensible, Coleridge substituait la notion de la Raison intuitive et les profondeurs du sentiment. On découvrait le monde intérieur. C'était le point de départ d'une vie et d'une ère nouvelles. Ainsi l'ont bien compris les Transcendantaux et leurs critiques. Quelles que fussent les obscurités et les fantaisies métaphysiques de Coleridge on trouvait en lui "Dieu perçu d'un point de vue central," "God viewed from one position" (Emerson, *Journals*, II, 277). Si la distinction est fondée, le Transcendantalisme est vrai. C'est ce que comprennent les adversaires, de là l'acharnement qu'ils mettent à la réfuter. En quoi faisant, ce qu'ils attaquent, ils ne s'y trompent point, est capital, c'est la prétension qu'ont les novateurs de bouleverser tout l'ordre de la connaissance et d'accorder au sentiment et

[1] "Every English and American reader must fail to penetrate even the husk of German and mock-German philosophy, unless he has accepted the distinction between the reason and the understanding" (*Transcendentalism* [two articles from the *Princeton Review*], p. 15). C'est elle que les critiques d'Emerson relèvent dans ses premiers ouvrages. Cf. *ibid.*, *pass.* et pp. 17–18. L'auteur du compte-rendu de *Nature* n'a pas de peine à retrouver dans le livre d'Emerson "the distinction so much insisted on by the New School, between the Reason and the Understanding." Mais il n' y a pas deux ordres de vérités et l'auteur n'admet pas le distinguo (*Ch. Exam.*, XXI, 383). Cf. Marsh, *Aids to Reflection, Preliminary Essay*, pp. 95–99; Carlyle, *Essays*, II, 25 ff.; *The Life of J. Sterling*, I, chap. viii. Pour la critique voir Murdock, *op. cit.*, chap. xiv.

à l'intuition des droits qui étaient jusqu'ici le privilège de la raison raisonnante. Une révolution est là en germe dans tous les ordres de l'action et de la pensée, de là les attaques.

On voit combien est étroit le point de vue de M. Girard. Non, Coleridge n'a pas donné seulement aux Unitaires orthodoxes un moyen *in extremis* de concilier le dogme avec la philosophie. Pour les Transcendantaux et même pour leurs adversaires Coleridge a été un véritable maître de la vie intérieure et un instaurateur de la vraie spiritualité. Le Transcendantalisme américain sous sa forme essentiellement religieuse n'a pas eu de source plus authentique que ses ouvrages.[1]

C'est cet aspect le plus large et le plus religieux de la philosophie de Coleridge que le président Marsh mettait en lumière dès 1829 dans sa célèbre Préface aux *Aids to Reflection*,[1] véritable manifeste du Transcendantalisme naissant. Marsh dénonce l'union contre nature d'une philosophie sensualiste de son essence et qui nie le surnaturel avec un mouvement religieux. Il ramène la controverse entre libéraux et orthodoxes au conflit entre le spiritualisme et le rationalisme lockien. Il montre très bien que la renaissance religieuse et philosophique sont inséparables et qu'elles peuvent avoir lieu à la faveur de la distinction proposée par Coleridge. Fond et forme il y a dans Coleridge les sources d'une apologétique nouvelle. Coleridge est aussi religieux que Pascal, et de la même façon (*The Complete Works of S. T. Coleridge* [New York, 1884], Vol. I, p. 26). Il nous conduit au point central et intérieur où "la foi et la raison se rencontrent" (p. 40). Coleridge fonde la religion sur le sens moral et la conscience (pp. 69–70). Pour Coleridge le christianisme n'est que "la perfection de la raison humaine" (p. 73). Il n'y a pas deux vérités. Ce qui est vrai en religion doit l'être en philosophie (pp. 76–77). Le centre de la philosophie de Coleridge c'est sa distinction entre l'entendement et la raison (pp. 97–98).

[1] Coleridge est le seul à qui le Transcendantalisme fût naturel: "To him it was truth; he was a mystic; he had faith in what he said, for his words were to him the symbols of his own thoughts" *Transcendentalism* (two articles from the *Princeton Review*), p. 98. Cf. *Ch. Exam.*, XIV, 108 ff., une intéressante défense de Coleridge: "He is certainly not a shallow writer, but, as we think, a very profound one." Sur l'influence de Coleridge, *ibid.*, XXIII, 186: "Coleridge and Carlyle have been the leaders of the sect in England, and it is somewhat remarkable that the popularity of each is greater on this side of the Atlantic than it is at home."

Voilà comment Coleridge se présentait dès 1829 en Nouvelle-Angleterre aux esprits désireux d'une renaissance religieuse et l'on voit mal, après cela, ce que la définition du Transcendantalisme sous sa forme essentiellement religieuse pouvait laisser à désirer.[1]

COUSIN ET LE TRANSCENDANTALISME

La part qui revient au fondateur de l'éclectisme français dans l'histoire du Transcendantalisme américain est importante. Nous ne croyons pas cependant que l'influence de Cousin se soit exercée uniquement ni principalement dans le sens indiqué par M. Girard. Nous croyons même que si, comme M. Girard a prétendu le prouver, le Transcendantalisme avait trouvé avant 1835 dans la personne de Channing ses formes les plus originales et définitives, l'influence de Cousin aurait été à peu près nulle à ce moment-là sur le mouvement. M. Girard ne nous semble guère dans le vrai quand il écarte du débat la théorie cousinienne de *la Raison spontanée* et nous montre les Transcendantaux ne cherchant dans l'éclectisme français qu'un moyen de concilier "la raison et l'évangile." Dans son excellent résumé de philosophie transcendantale John Murdock soutiendra, au contraire, non sans motif, que la pierre angulaire du Transcendantalisme c'est la théorie cousinienne de la raison.[2] Pour Murdock, comme pour M. Girard, mais dans un sens autrement large, le Transcendantalisme n'est autre chose que l'éclectisme démarqué par les Unitaires libéraux. La source authentique entre toutes en est l'*Introduction à l'histoire de la philosophie* traduite par Linberg. C'est là, à en croire Murdock, que Brownson, Emerson et Parker ont puisé non

[1] L'histoire de l'influence exercée par Coleridge sur l'évolution religieuse des Transcendantaux serait à étudier en détail. C'est à Coleridge et à sa distinction des facultés que James Freeman Clarke reconnaît avoir pris l'art de subordonner la logique à l'intuition (*J. F. Clarke*, par E. E. Hale, Boston, 1891 [p. 42]). Channing trouvait dans la poésie de Coleridge et de Wordsworth "une théologie plus spirituelle que dans les écrits de controverse des Unitaires et Trinitaires" (Ap. Peabody, p. 72). Et il déclarait devoir à Coleridge plus qu'à tout autre penseur (*ibid.*, p. 75). Dans son compte-rendu du *Rationale* de Martineau fort important dans l'histoire du Transcendantalisme G. Ripley ne manque pas de rapprocher les vues de l'auteur avec celle du président Marsh dans "son admirable" Préface aux *Aids to Reflection*, *Ch. Exam.*, XXI, 236.

[2] *Op. cit.*, 178 ff.: "Whoever, therefore, would understand the Transcendental writers, must first understand, if he can, the French philosopher Cousin and the German pantheists. . . . . The radical principle of the Transcendental philosophy, the corner-stone of the whole edifice is Cousin's doctrine that Spontaneous Reason acquaints us with the true and essential nature of things." L'essentiel de la théorie cousinienne de la Raison est donné par Frothingham, *op. cit.*, pp. 67–73. Voir surtout p. 72.

seulement leurs principes philosophiques mais jusqu'à leurs formes de style et de pensée, ce qui d'ailleurs est contestable.[1]

Qu'il y eût dans ce fait de quoi inspirer bien des méfiances à ceux des Unitaires qui pouvaient être tentés d'emprunter à Cousin les éléments d'une apologétique nouvelle, les témoignages contemporains le prouvent. Si certains, tels Brownson ou Ripley, se laissaient prendre à la large tolérance et aux sympathies chrétiennes affichées par Cousin, tous n'étaient pas dupes et découvraient qu'au fond sa spiritualité n'en est pas une: "We may well grieve," lisons-nous dans le *Christian Examiner*,[2] "that the genius of Cousin should avail through its attractive speculations . . . . to substitute a mystical faith in a God that is no God, in a Christianity that is no Christianity, for the faith of the Bible which so long has answered so well."

Les craintes de Channing n'étaient pas moins vives. Il regrettait de voir les Transcendantaux s'identifier avec ce qu'il appelait le système "*grossier*" de Cousin et compromettre la vie originale du mouvement pour substituer l'inspiration personnelle et ce qu'on nommait autour de lui "*l'égo-théisme*," au christianisme.[3] C'est dans le même esprit que les adversaires, tel Norton, attaquent la philosophie religieuse de Cousin à la base de laquelle ils retrouvent la théorie panthéiste de la Raison divine. Qu'elle ait embarrassé les partisans de Cousin eux-mêmes, la preuve en est dans les contradictions où tombe Brownson quand il entreprend de défendre son maître contre le reproche de panthéisme. Il n'y arrive qu'en sacrifiant l'*Introduction à l'histoire de la philosophie*[4] et en tirant du côté des Ecossais et même de Locke celui en qui l'on prétend voir un disciple de Fichte et de Hegel, et la défense est assez faible après l'exposé fort complet du système de Cousin et de sa philosophie de la Raison donné par Brownson qui l'accepte malgré certaines réserves.

[1] Pour Norton et la *Princeton Review*, Emerson est bien un disciple authentique de Cousin. La question demanderait un sérieux examen. M. Girard suggère lui-même le rapprochement (p. 486, n. 66). Il a perdu là une belle occasion de faire d'Emerson un Transcendantal de marque. Nulle sur l'évolution religieuse d'Emerson, l'influence de Cousin n'a pas manqué, croyons-nous, d'inspirer la théorie emersonienne de la Raison. C'est ce que nous nous proposons d'étudier à part.

[2] *Ch. Exam.* (July, 1840), p. 380.

[3] Frothingham, pp. 111–12.

[4] Cf. *Ch. Exam.*, XXI, 33 ff. et 181, *pass.*

Que Cousin ait emprunté aux Allemands sa théorie de la Raison, principe essentiel de son système, tout le monde est d'accord là-dessus. On n'a pas de peine à découvrir dans ses œuvres les traces "du monstre échappé aux forêts d'Allemagne." Si la méthode cousinienne et le point de départ de l'éclectisme diffèrent de ceux de Hegel, de Fichte et de Schelling, le point d'arrivée est le même. Le fait n'est pas douteux.[1] Murdock et la *Princeton Review* en particulier en donnent des preuves fort précises.[2] Les articles de la *Princeton Review* s'appuient sur des citations de première main et renvoient aux sources originales. Nous voyons mal ce qu'on pourrait reprendre à cette critique de l'équivoque cousinienne. La *Princeton Review* relève très bien ce qu'il y a de théâtral et de truqué dans l'idéalisme de Cousin. Elle raille sa façon de disposer haut la main des plus graves problèmes. A la vanité de l'éclectique, pair de France, elle oppose la modestie de Descartes. Elle stigmatise comme il convient la matérialisme historique de l'*Introduction à la philosophie de l'histoire*, la cynique apologie de la guerre et du succès qui embarrassait fort les partisans de Cousin.[3] Nous ne croyons pas que l'on ait mieux montré le vice inhérent à l'idéalisme du fondateur de l'éclectisme que l'a fait la *Princeton Review* dans le passage suivant:

He does not indeed teach what is commonly meant by fatalism. He is a strenuous advocate for the freedom of the will and talks much of free personality. But then this freedom itself is but one of the products of a deeper fatalism which pervades the universe and works out its results in all things.

Cousin est un brillant orateur, un rhéteur plus qu'un philosophe; la théorie de la Raison spontanée est le centre de son système et cette

[1] C'est ce que reconnait Brownson lui-même. *Ch. Exam.*, XXI, 62: "Once in the Absolute, he does not differ essentially from the new German school. He follows Schelling and Hegel very nearly in going from God to nature and humanity, and in his march through history, but the method is different." S'il y avait doute à ce sujet on trouvera dans l'article de Brownson toutes les preuves requises.

[2] "Cousin seems aware that these views approximate so near those of Schelling that they may expose him to the charge of pantheism, a charge which he did not well know how to answer" (Murdock, *op. cit.*, p. 154). Et tel est bien le verdict des historiens actuels et les plus autorisés de la philosophie. Cf. K. Hoeffding, *Histoire de la philosophie moderne* (trad. Bordier), II, 323: A la théorie de Reid sur la perception immédiate Cousin "ajouta plus tard encore la théorie de Schelling et de Hegel sur la raison absolue."

[3] Et qui était bien peu faite pour lui attirer les sympathies de W. E. Channing, apôtre de la paix, et dont on sait les diatribes contre Napoléon en particulier (*Remarks on the Life and Character of Napoleon Bonaparte*) et contre le guerre.

théorie est allemande. C'est elle qui fait de Cousin un Transcendantaliste. Sa religion n'en est pas une. Il enseigne le panthéisme tout en protestant de ses sympathies chrétiennes. Son matérialisme historique a perverti sa morale. Voilà sur Cousin le verdict des contemporains (y compris Channing), verdict contre lequel Ripley, Brownson et Henry auront bien de la peine à s'inscrire en faux.[1]

CARLYLE ET LE TRANSCENDANTALISME

Que dès avant 1836 Carlyle ait été, au même titre que Coleridge et Cousin, l'intermédiaire obligé de l'idéologie allemande outre-mer par ses articles très remarqués dans les revues anglaises, qu'à partir de 1835, surtout par les soins d'Emerson et par l'édition américaine au succès considérable de *Sartor Resartus*, il ait apporté au Transcendantalisme un renfort capital et tout de suite reconnu, c'est ce qu'il serait aisé de prouver. Nous voudrions du moins, par les notes suivantes, inspirer des doutes très sérieux sur le bien fondé de l'ostracisme prononcé par M. Girard contre Carlyle. Le *Christian Examiner* de septembre 1836 (XXI, 74) par la plume de N. L. Frothingham consacre un article fort élogieux à *Sartor Resartus*. Il en relève surtout le caractère profondément religieux: "It has more sound religion and ethics than slumber in the folios of many a body of divinity. . . . . What we chiefly prize in it is its philosophic, spiritual, humane cast of thought. We fearlessly commend it to . . . . many who will find their hearts greatly in unison with it." Voilà pour prouver

[1] Sur la controverse à ce sujet cf. W. Riley, "La Philosophie française en Amérique," *Revue philosophique*, novembre 1917.

Nous avons vainement cherché le numéro de la *North American Review*—indiqué par M. Girard, p. 471, n. 46—dans lequel l'éditeur de la revue, Alexandre Everett (c'est Edward Everett qu'il faut lire) introduisait en 1829 l'éclectisme auprès de ses lecteurs. En revanche (même année, même numéro) la revue donne bien un compte-rendu des œuvres de Cousin. Nous y lisons que Cousin est aussi obscur que les Allemands auxquels il emprunte sa terminologie. Ses vues sont trop sommaires pour les comprendre. Il ne résout pas les questions qu'il pose. Quant a l'idéalisme, qu'il s'agisse de Platon, de Kant ou de Cousin c'est "un tissu d'absurdités" (*ibid.* [July, 1829], pp. 67 ff.).

Nous avons vainement cherché également "les remarques fort élogieuses" dont la *North American Review* aurait fait suivre en 1832 l'*Introduction à l'histoire de la philosophie* (trad. Linberg). Par contre nous trouvons bien à la date indiquée (XXXV, 19–36) un résumé de la célèbre *Introduction* d'après l'édition française avec les remarques suivantes fort peu élogieuses: "His explanation [de la Raison spontanée] does not differ essentially from that of Fichte." Et elle n'explique rien. "There is in this writer a fondness for system and a disposition to generalize on insufficient grounds, which will bar his approach to perfection" (p. 35). Cousin n'a pas une aussi bonne presse en Amérique que le prétend M. Girard.

que "comme nous l'affirmions plus haut, entre l'individualisme hautain de l'historien anglais et le spiritualisme des premiers Transcendantalistes il n'y a rien de commun" (Girard, p. 411).[1]

Passons au second point: "L'interprète de la pensée allemande auprès des peuples anglo-saxons n'eut pour l'idéalisme d'un Kant . . . aucune espèce de sympathie" (Girard, p. 411).

Venons à la preuve: "Kant's philosophy," écrit Carlyle dans un de ses essais, cité par M. Girard, "is not only an absurdity, but a wickedness and a horror . . . . his doctrine is a region of boundless baleful gloom, too cunningly broken here and there by splendors of unholy fire." Ouvrons maintenant les *Essais* de Carlyle (I, 74). Nous y retrouvons bien le verdict ci-dessus mais encadré de la façon suivante: "Among a certain class of thinkers, does a frantic exaggeration in sentiment . . . . anywhere break forth, it is directly labelled as Kantism. . . . . For often *in such circles*" ici la phrase citée par M. Girard et que Carlyle parlant cette fois en son nom fait suivre de la remarque suivante: "*If anything in the history of philosophy could surprise us, it might well be this.*" Et Carlyle fait l'éloge de Kant.

Que penser d'une pareille méthode de citer les textes et d'écrire l'histoire ?[2]

[1] L'histoire de *Sartor Resartus* en Amérique constitue un chapitre des plus importants de l'histoire du Transcendantalisme. On sait que le succès du livre fut incomparablement plus grand en Amérique qu'en Angleterre. L'accueil fut des plus bienveillants même dans les milieux théologiques et la publication successive de la *Révolution française* et des *Essais* de Carlyle ne fit que le confirmer. Carlyle fit entre autres sur Channing une impression profonde (cf. *Carlyle-Emerson Correspondence*, I, 59). La *North American Review* loue le livre (octobre 1835, p. 481) et y trouve "a great deal of deep thought, sound principle, and fine writing." Elle rappelle que Carlyle est l'auteur des articles parus dans les revues anglaises "which have attracted great attention by the singularity of their style and the richness and depth of their matter." Quand il s'agit de publier en 1835 un organe du mouvement nouveau, *The Transcendentalist*, c'est à Carlyle que l'on songe comme éditeur. On ne s'est pas trompé en reconnaissant dans *Sartor* en particulier la bible transcendantale. Cf. *New-Englander*, I (1843), 503 *pass.*, "A Plain Discussion with a Transcendentalist."

[2] Le maniement des textes semble un art inconnu à M. Girard (voir en particulier p. 417 de son ouvrage ses citations de Mme de Staël). Voici quelques errata à ajouter à notre liste (p. 389). M. Girard veut mettre sous l'autorité d'Emerson "placé mieux que personne pour étudier le transcendantalisme," bien qu'il ne soit pas transcendantal, sa définition "essentiellement religieuse" du mouvement. Malheureusement la citation n'est pas d'Emerson. Elle est de W. H. Channing (*Memoirs of Margaret Fuller*, II, 11) (p. 438). L'auteur des *Discourses on the Philosophy of Religion* (1836) n'est pas Parker étudiant à Harvard à cette époque mais Ripley "l'âme" du Transcendantalisme (*ibid.* p. 438, n. 6). Le discours de Norton sur *The Latest Form of Infidelity* n'est pas de 1838 mais de juillet 1839, un an exactement après l'adresse fameuse d'Emerson à Cambridge et c'est bien à Emerson encore plus qu'à Ripley que Norton riposte dans son discours.

Concluons: Tel qu'il se présente à nous dans les périodiques et les ouvrages de controverse de l'époque et pris dans son ensemble le Transcendantalisme américain est un idéalisme nouveau qui devient de notoriété publique aux environs de 1836, au moment où Emerson compose ses premiers ouvrages et où paraissent en Amérique ceux de Carlyle. Ce n'est pas uniquement une forme plus large de l'unitarisme mais *une philosophie nouvelle* et d'application générale,[1] que les contemporains et les Transcendantalistes eux-mêmes, à tort ou à raison, confondent avec l'idéalisme allemand et surtout kantien.

On attaque cette philosophie parcequ'elle est nouvelle dans son fond et dans sa forme, parcequ'elle est d'origine étrangère, qu'elle prétend soumettre à la Raison prise dans un sens nouveau des problèmes qu'elle n'a pas autorité pour résoudre, qu'elle confond l'ordre poétique et philosophique et finalement qu'on la soupçonne de conduire au panthéisme en religion.

Cette philosophie, supposée allemande dans ses sources, on la connaît surtout sous sa forme anglaise et française, par Coleridge, Carlyle et Cousin que l'on confond dans le même anathème, si l'on est dans le camp adverse, et dans le même éloge si l'on est Transcendantaliste, avec Kant et les idéalistes allemands.

Le pli est pris. Il est entendu désormais que "la philosophie transcendantale a son origine en Allemagne." Procédé facile et que l'on s'explique, non seulement par ce que Coleridge, Carlyle, Cousin et leurs disciples américains empruntent réellement aux philosophes allemands et qui n'est pas négligeable, mais encore par la considération suivante. Résolus à condamner a priori et à designer à la vindicte publique un mouvement d'idées qu'ils jugent dangereux pour la foi, les Unitaires orthodoxes ne se soucient point d'en rechercher les sources américaines. Il est de bonne guerre de dénoncer le Transcendantalisme comme une importation étrangère et de le rendre suspect en le présentant sous sa forme radicale et allemande. On le confond donc avec ce mouvement philosophique qui lui ressemble en en exagérant certains traits: l'idéalisme allemand contemporain.

[1] De ces applications multiples Ch. M. Ellis nous donne, dans la brochure qu'on lui attribue sur le *Transcendantalisme* (Boston, 1842), le programme très complet et précis sous ces rubriques: "Critique," "Art," "Gouvernement et organisation sociale," "Religion." Le chapitre sur la critique est en particulier fort original.

Cette confusion, les Transcendantalistes l'acceptent, à peu près à l'unanimité. Moitié défi, moitié expédient, ils adoptent l'epithète nouvelle d'origine philosophique mais dont le sens s'est d'ailleurs beaucoup étendu pour désigner un état d'esprit particulier.[1] L'étiquette allemande est pour les Transcendantalistes un moyen commode d'affirmer contre les partisans de l'ancien sensualisme leur tendances idéalistes et de se donner à peu de frais une philosophie.

Tel se présente le Transcendantalisme sous son aspect historique. Si légitime qu'il soit de vouloir reviser le procès il est impossible de ne pas tenir compte de ces faits.

En réalité ce que les Transcendantalistes doivent à Kant et à sa critique c'est, et à peu près uniquement, contre Locke la reconnaissance d'un ordre d'idées dépassant l'expérience et permettant d'établir la certitude sur la base du sens intime et de l'intuition. A Cousin principalement, et par son intermédiaire aux métaphysiciens allemands à qui Cousin l'emprunte, ils doivent la théorie de la Raison conçue comme un moyen direct et infaillible de connaissance transcendante.

Quant à leur théorie si importante (et au fond d'ailleurs si autochtone dans l'œuvre de Channing par exemple et si personnelle pour chacun d'eux) de l'existence d'un sens religieux autonome, c'est à Coleridge, selon nous (sans oublier B. Constant et ses précurseurs allemands Jacobi et Herder[2]), beaucoup plus qu'à Cousin qu'ils l'empruntent. Ces distinctions, les Transcendantalistes et les historiens du mouvement transcendantal ne les ont pas faites et il est bien vrai que la confusion et l'acceptation en bloc de toutes les influences énumerées ci-dessus est un trait caractéristique du Transcendantalisme américain. Elles ne s'en imposent pas moins et quand la thèse de M. Girard n'aurait servi qu'à les mettre en évidence, elle serait par là justifiée. M. Girard a eu la très louable intention de reviser un procès et de rendre au spiritualisme français la part qui lui revient,

[1] Sur cette extension populaire du vocable et sur les confusions que de bonne heure elle implique voir les remarques de Brownson, *Ch. Exam.*, XXIII, 181 ff., et particulièrement *An Essay on Transcendentalism* (Boston, 1842), *pass.* et pp. 8–10; *Dial*, III, 405–6; *New Englander*, I (1843), 503.

[2] Pas plus que Schleiermacher ni de Wette dont certains mettaient la philosophie religieuse au-dessus de l'ouvrage fameux de B. Constant au quel d'ailleurs M. Girard a rendu pleine justice. Cf. *Ch. Exam.*, XX, 164.

et elle est grande, dans l'histoire du Transcendantalisme américain. On pouvait y arriver, croyons nous, sans déplacer l'axe historique du mouvement transcendantal, sans en fausser à certains égards la physionomie originale ni sacrifier surtout aux mânes de Victor Cousin qui ne le mérite guère, après Kant, Coleridge, et Carlyle, l'œuvre entière d'Emerson.

RÉGIS MICHAUD

SMITH COLLEGE

THE REQUIREMENTS OF A POET

A NOTE ON THE SOURCES OF BEN JONSON'S *TIMBER*, PARAGRAPH 130

The studies of Schelling,[1] Spingarn,[2] Simpson,[3] and Castelain[4] would seem to have left undiscovered no source for any part of Jonson's *Timber* (1641). A field however rich would seem to offer but meager gleanings after such assiduous reaping. Paragraph 130 has already been shown by M. Castelain to be an aggregation of verbal borrowings, echoes, and close translations from Scaliger, Cicero, Seneca, Ovid, Petronius, Quintilian, Horace, Valerius Maximus, Bacon, Persius, Simylus, Daniel Heinsius, Aulus Gellius, and Suetonius. In the same paragraph, however, there is an analysis of the requirements of a poet which is of peculiar interest to the student of the theory of poetry and the theory of rhetoric in the English Renaissance. This analysis, I believe, has not previously been traced to its source or discussed critically.

In the passage mentioned, Jonson requires of the poet the following qualities (the reader is referred to the edition of M. Castelain for the complete text):

> *First*, wee require in our *Poet* or maker . . . . a goodnes of naturall wit. For, whereas all other Arts consist of Doctrine, and Precepts: the *Poet* must bee able by nature, and instinct, to powre out the Treasure of his minde. . . . .
>
> To this perfection of Nature in our Poet, wee require Exercise of those parts, and frequent. Things wrote with labour, deserve to be so read, and will last their Age.
>
> The third requisite in our *Poet*, or Maker, is *Imitation*, to bee able to convert the substance or Riches of another *Poet*, to his owne use. To make choise of one excellent man above the rest, and so to follow him, till he grow very Hee; or so like him, as the Copie may be mistaken for the Principall.

[1] Ben Jonson, *Discoveries*, ed. by Felix E. Schelling, Boston, 1892.

[2] Joel Elias Spingarn, *A History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance*, New York, 1899.

[3] Percy Simpson, "Tanquam Explorator, Jonson's Method in the Discoveries," *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, II (1906–7), 201 ff.

[4] Ben Jonson, *Discoveries*, a critical edition by Maurice Castelain, Paris, 1906.

Not, as a Creature, that swallowes, what it takes in, crude, raw, or undigested; but, that feeds with an Appetite, and hath a Stomacke to concoct, devide, and turne all into nourishment. Not, to imitate servilely, as Horace saith. . . . .

But, that which we especially require in him is an exactnesse of Studie, and multiplicity of reading, which maketh a full man. . . . . There goes more to his making then so; For to nature, Exercise, Imitation and Study, *Art* must be added, to make all these perfect. And, though these challenge to themselves much, in the making up of our Maker, it is Art only can lead him to perfection.

From the marginal notes we can summarize his analysis as follows: (1) *ingenium;* (2) *exercitatio;* (3) *imitatio;* (4) *lectio;* (5) *ars* (*ars coron*).

It is at once evident that there is just such an inconsistency between Jonson's insistence on the inspirational theory of poetry at the beginning and his final dictum that art only can lead the poet to perfection, as one would expect from a commonplace book. The result is that the paragraph as it stands is a critical monstrosity fairly representative of the Renaissance eclecticism which considered every ancient an authority, both by himself and in combination with others of opposing views.

That the poet should be able by nature to pour out the treasure of his mind, that he should be gifted with *ingenium*, genius, the poetic rapture, is Platonism. Indeed Jonson quotes both Plato and Aristotle, from Seneca, not from the source, however, to uphold his point. Plato says of it, speaking through Socrates in the *Phaedrus* (245), that there is a madness which comes to those possessed of the Muses and inspires a poetical frenzy, and in the *Ion* (533 and 534) he says that good poets compose their poems not by art but through inspiration. Aristotle, also, in the *Poetics* (xvii) says that a poet must be gifted by nature or have a strain of madness in him, and in *Rhetoric* (iii. 7) he says that poetry, unlike oratory, is inspired.

Thus far Jonson is preaching the Platonic theory of inspiration in poetry. The rest of the analysis is not poetic, the theory of poetry, but rhetoric. Protagoras is said to have originated the analysis of the requirements of an orator. His analysis is as follows: (1) *φύσις* (*natura*); (2) *τέχνη* (*ars*); (3) *ἄσκησις*, or *μελέτη* (*exercitatio*).[1]

[1] Cicero, *De oratore* (ed. by A. S. Wilkins), Introd., p. 57.

Plato recognizes a difference between the poet and the orator, insisting that the poet must be inspired, but following Protagoras for the requirements of the speaker. Oratorical success depends partly on natural ability and partly on art. Natural ability (φύσις), knowledge (ἐπιστήμη), and practice (μελέτη) are equally necessary (*Phaedrus* 269). Aristotle recognizes poetic and rhetoric as distinct arts by devoting a separate treatise to each. The poet, he thinks, should be inspired, but he makes no such requirement for the orator, furnishing, indeed, no example of such an analysis as is found in Jonson's *Timber*.

The most characteristic early Latin rhetoric is that addressed by its anonymous author to Caius Herennius (81 B.C.). The Middle Ages believed it to be written by Cicero. It presents a quite different analysis, omitting all mention of *ingenium*, but making imitation co-ordinate with the others.

> Haec omnia [successful public speech] tribus rebus adsequi poterimus, *arte*, *imitatione*, *exercitatione*. Ars est praeceptio, quae dat certam viam rationemque dicendi. Imitatio est, qua impellimur cum diligenti ratione ut aliquorum similes in dicendo velimus esse. Exercitatio est adsiduus usus consuetudoque dicendi.[1]

In a later section the author admits the need of natural parts and suggests the mutual interdependence of nature and training, "ut ingenio doctrina, praeceptione natura nitescat" (*Ad Her.* iii. 16. 29). The definition of *ars*, as precept, a body of theory, rules, gives the classical conception of the word as it is used by Jonson. The idea also that *exercitatio* is assiduous use, practice, falls in with the conception expressed by Jonson. This is a more limited definition, however, than that given by Cicero and Quintilian.

Cicero in his *Brutus* (vi. 25) says that eloquence may proceed from (1) *ars*, (2) *exercitatio*, and (3) *natura*, but does not there appraise their relative importance. In his *Pro Archia poeta* (i. 1), also he refers to the same qualities as (1) *ingenium*, (2) *exercitatio*, and (3) *ratio* and *disciplina*, giving his old teacher the credit for his progress in

[1] Cicero, *Opera rhetorica*, recognovit Guliemus Friedrich. Vol. I, continens libros ad C. Herennium, et de inventione (Lipsiae, 1893), i. 2. 3.

each branch. It is in his *De oratore*, however, that Cicero gives his fullest development of the classification.

1. *Natura et ingenium* (*De orat.* i. 25. 113–15).—Natural talent gives the greatest power to public speech. Mentally it gives the orator acumen, fertility, and a good memory. Physically it equips him with a ready tongue, a good voice, vigor, and a pleasing appearance. This natural talent cannot be given by art, but it may be sharpened. With but slight talent a man may become an ordinarily good speaker but not a perfect orator. Some, however, are hopeless.

2. *Ars* (*De orat.* i. 32. 146).—By *ars* Cicero, like all classical writers on rhetoric, means the rules and precepts of the rhetoricians. The rules are the result of observing the practice of great speakers and consequently are of less importance than *natura*. "Sic esse non eloquentiam ex artificio sed artificium, ex eloquentia natum." Nevertheless the rules are a useful element in the education of an orator and should not be neglected. In a later book (*De orat.* ii. 87. 356) he repeats that art educates but cannot create an orator. For instance, the mnemonic system of Simonides is useful in strengthening the memory which a man may already have.

3. *Exercitatio* (*De orat.* i. 33–34).—Unlike the author of *Ad Herennium* and Jonson, who use the word in the sense of constant practice, Cicero means by *exercitatio* the pedagogical devices by means of which the student learns to speak effectively. The following, he says, are useful: speaking, writing, paraphrase, translation, imitation, reading of poetry and history, study of law and politics. In Jonson's analysis imitation and reading are elevated from their subordinate position to become main heads. Like Jonson, Cicero insists that the orator must be a learned man. In a later book (*De orat.* ii. 22. 90–92) Antonius recommends that the young student pick out a good model of imitation and imitate the good qualities, avoiding mannerisms. This approaches closer to Jonson's "one man" but does not go so far. In the *De inventione* (ii. 1), Cicero says that he adopts the best from previous writers on rhetoric, just as Zeuxis painted his Helen of Crotona from the five most beautiful virgins. Erasmus, in his *Ciceronianus* (1528), uses the same story as an argument against the imitation of one man. In Jonson's analysis there is evidently little or no direct indebtedness to Cicero.

Quintilian, the rhetorician *par excellence*, naturally gives the fullest development of this rhetorical classification in his *De institutione oratoria* (*ca.* 68–88 A.D.), "Facultas orandi consummatur *natura, arte, exercitatione*" (iii. 5. 1). This is the threefold division of Protagoras, Plato, and Cicero. Of the relative importance of nature and nurture, natural talent and theoretical training, Quintilian says, "Consummatus orator nisi ex utroque fieri potest" (ii. 19. 1). If an orator had to be deprived of one of these elements, he could best dispense with training. Again, a man moderately equipped with both will owe more to nature but "consummatos . . . . plus doctrinae debere quam naturae putabo" (ii. 19. 2). He supports this very high opinion of training by an analogy with agriculture, for a good farmer will cause good soil to produce more than if it were uncultivated. Like Cicero, Quintilian considers *natura* as being largely physical. Thus he says that *ars* will not help a man if he is not equipped by *natura*, not only with a good memory, but with a pleasing utterance and appearance as well (xi. 3. 11–13).[1] It seems quite appropriate that both Cicero and Quintilian, while agreeing that art and nature are both necessary, should show a special bias in allotting the preponderance. Cicero, the orator, would rather like to consider himself a genius; while Quintilian, professor of rhetoric, would tend to appreciate the full value of instruction in his subject.

But to Quintilian precepts, though necessary, are not sufficient to make an orator if unsupported by exercise. Of this there are three equally necessary processes: *scribere*, *legere*, and *dicere* (x. 1. 1). In the next paragraph but one he says, *dicere, imitatio, scribendi*. This illustrates one of the salient reasons for reading—the study of expression. The student should read all literature not only for subject-matter (*propter historias modo*) but also for words, manner of expression (i. 4. 4; also x. 1. 5 ff.). But imitation, says Quintilian, is of two sorts: *in audiendo* (x. 1. 8, and 5. 17–20) and *in legendo* (x. 1–2), the latter being the more important. The interrelations

[1] Good organs of speech and tone of voice, strength of body, and grace of motion are of such power that they frequently gain for their possessor the reputation for *ingenium* (xii. 5. 5). Here *ingenium* seems to mean mental qualities and *natura*, physical. This differentiation is uncommon.

of *lectio* and *imitatio* according to Quintilian are best illustrated by the following diagram:

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} \textit{lectio} \left\{\begin{array}{l} \textit{propter historias modo} \\ \textit{propter verba—in legendo} \end{array}\right. \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \textit{in audiendo} \end{array}\right\} \textit{imitatio}$$

Imitation, to Quintilian, seems very useful, but with only imitation the student can never surpass his models. He should imitate not one man but the excellencies of all men. He should imitate not words only but all elements of expression.

Tacitus, in his *Dialogus* (*ca.* 84–85 A.D. or 94–95 A.D.), lays his emphasis in a new place. While Cicero had glorified natural ability and Quintilian had exalted the technical elements, Tacitus, admitting the force of both, lays greatest stress on a combination of talent and practice. Maternus is made to say, "Neque enim tantum arte et scientia, sed longe magis facultate et *usu* eloquentiam contineri" (*Dialogus* xxxiii). In addition he agrees with Cicero that the orator must be a truly educated man (*Dialogus* xxx). His attitude toward imitation is not stated directly, but he recommends in section xxxiii that the student accompany his master to the forum, and there not only see how he pleads his cause but observe the opponent and the effect on the auditors. This is Quintilian's imitation *in audiendo*. From this we may conclude that one model for imitation would be distasteful to Tacitus. Here we have no apparent direct influence on Jonson.

Thus the classical treatises on rhetoric, with the exception of *Ad Herennium*, all follow the classification of Protagoras, insisting that the finished orator must have native ability, knowledge of rhetorical theory, and familiarity through practice. But the treatises on the theory of poetry in classical times did not cleave to Plato's theory of poetic inspiration. They set up in its stead a rhetorical ideal which resulted in the learned content and sophisticated style of the later Greek and Latin poets. The poets were burdened by technique. Their *ingenium* had to be disciplined and governed by *ars*.[1] For example, Horace in his *Ad Pisonem* (*ca.* 13–8 B.C.) writes in the spirit

[1] E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa* (1898), pp. 182 ff.

of the rhetoricians when he says that *natura* and *ars* are equally needful in poetry:

> Natura fieret laudabile carmen an arte
> quaesitum est: ego nec studium sine divite vena,
> nec rude quid prosit video ingenium [ll. 408–12].

Jonson knew his Horace and quoted from him freely, but he could not have obtained suggestions from him for his analysis, for Horace has no such complete division. Like the *Ad Pisonem* of Horace, the anonymous treatise *De sublimitate*, at one time ascribed to Longinus, is under rhetorical influence, but it comes much nearer to being a genuine discussion of poetic. The author names five essentials to lofty style: the power of forming lofty conceptions (*νοήσεις ἀδρεπήβολον*), inspired passion (*ἐνθουσιαστικὸν πάθος*), figures, phraseology, and composition. The first two are derived from natural genius, the last three from art (viii. 1). The insistence on the emotional basis of poetry, on its quality of inspiration, brings the author closer to Plato, Aristotle, and the true conception of poetic than are any of his fellow-critics of a rhetorical age. But the treatise is far from consistently Platonic. The author believes that, although nature is the basis of lofty conceptions and inspired passion, it frequently needs the curb of art. Nature is good fortune; art, good counsel (i). "Success of never failing is in most cases due to art, the success of high, although not uniform, excellence, to genius; that, therefore, art should ever be brought in to aid nature; where they are reciprocal the result should be perfection."[1] This doctrine is certainly not that of Platonism. Just as certainly it derives from the classical rhetorics.

In the Renaissance the logical distinctions of the classical critics very naturally became blurred. The distinction between rhetoric and poetic became almost lost, rhetoric being mainly interested in stylistic artifice, and poetic becoming rhetorical in its dependence on rules and its tendency to persuade. For example, the threefold analysis of oratorical requirements on the one hand suffered sea-change in its treatment by the Renaissance rhetoricians, and on the other was carried over in whole or in part into the treatises on poetic by the literary critics.

[1] Longinus (pseudo), *On the Sublime* (trans. by A. O. Prickard, Oxford, 1906), XXXVI, 4.

Among the rhetoricians Stephen Hawes in his allegorical didactic *Pastime of Pleasure* (1506) illustrates the tendency to garble classical theory. He conducts Grande Amour to the abode of *Rethoryke*, where the student is instructed as follows:

> To understandyng these iiii. accident:
> Doctryne, perceyveraunce, and exercyse,
> And also thereto is equypolent
> Evermore the perfyt practyse.

Farther on in the poem, he is given additional information:

> Than shal he knowe, by perfyte study,
> The memorial arte of rhetoryke defuse
> . . . . . .
> With exercyse he shal it well augment.[1]

Apparently Hawes does not concern himself as to whether natural talent, which he does not mention, or formal rules of art are more important. His analysis is confusing, but at least we may gather that he placed great faith in "doctryne" (*ars*) and "exercyse," or "practyse" (*exercitatio*, or *usus*). In his *Ciceronianus* (1528), Erasmus asserts that the fountain of eloquence is study, art, practice, meditation, sincerity, and native talent.

> Pectus opulenter instructum . . . . pectus *artis* praeceptionibus, tum multo scribendi dicendique *usu*, diutina *meditatione* praeparatum: &, quod est totius negocii caput, *pectus amans ea quae praedicat, odio prosequens ea quae vituperat.* His omnibus conjunctum oportet esse *naturae* judicium, prudendiam, & consilium, quae praeceptis contineri non possunt.[2]

He evidently includes imitation, although he deprecates its overuse, as may be seen in a later passage in the same work. The new element of sincerity introduced by Erasmus does not seem to have been popular among later writers. Sir Thomas Elyot does not pretend to teach rhetoric, but he thinks with Cicero that the true orator must be a learned man and a philosopher and deprecates the overemphasis on tropes and figures, which occupy so much space in the later works on rhetoric.[3]

[1] Reprinted from the edition of 1555, for the Percy Society, London, 1845, pp. 45, 51.

[2] Erasmus, *Dialogus, cui titulus ciceronianus, sive, de optimo dicendi genere*, in *Opera omnia* (Lugduni Batavorum, 1703), I, 1002 A.

[3] *The Boke named The Governour* (edited from the first ed. of 1531 by H. H. S. Croft, 2 vols., London, 1845), I, 116.

Louis Vives, recommended by Wilson in his translation of Demosthenes as "a Spaniarde, and one notably learned," like Elyot, is closer to the classical doctrine. In his *De ratione dicendi* (1537) he asserts that *ars* can accomplish little without *natura* and *exercitatio*.[1] Thomas Wilson's *Arte of Rhetorique* (1553)[2] is the earliest[3] and best example of classical rhetoric in England. Wilson's sources were Cicero's *De inventione* and *De oratore*, Quintilian, and the *Ad Herennium*, which he quotes believing it to be Cicero's.[4] At the very beginning of his treatise[5] he informs his reader "By what meanes Eloquence is Attained":

First needfull it is that hee, which desireth to excell in this gift of Oratorie, and longeth to prove an eloquent man, must naturally have a wit, and an aptnesse thereunto: then must he to his Booke, and learne to bee well stored with knowledge, that he may be able to minister matter for al causes necessarie. The which when he hath got plentifully, he must use much exercise, both in writing, and also in speaking. For though hee have a wit and learning together, yet shall they both little availe without much practise. . . . . Many men know the art very well, and be in all points throughly grounded and acquainted with the precepts, & yet it is not their hap to prove eloquent. And the reason is, that eloquence it selfe, came not up first by the art, but the arte rather was gathered upon eloquence.[6] . . . .

Now, before we use either to write, or speake eloquently, wee must dedicate our myndes wholy, to followe the most wise and learned men, and seeke to fashion as wel their speache and gesturing, as their witte or endyting. . . . .

To this purpose and for this use, is the arte compiled together, by the learned and wisemen, that those which are ignorant might iudge of the learned, and labour . . . . to followe their woorkes accordingly. Againe, the arte helpeth well to dispose and order matters of our owne invention, the which wee may followe as well in speaking as in writing, for though many by nature without art, have proved worthy men, yet is arte a surer guide

[1] *Opera omnia* (8 vols. in 7. Valentiae Edetanorum, 1782–90), II, 156.

[2] Edited by G. H. Mair, Oxford, 1909, from the ed. of 1560.

[3] Leonard Cox's *The Arte or Crafte of Rhethoryke* (edited from the ed. of 1530 by F. I. Carpenter, Chicago, 1899) discusses only *inventio* and is based on Melanchthon. He does not mention *ars*, *natura*, and *exercitatio*.

[4] I shall present my evidence for this statement in a forthcoming detailed study of the sources of Wilson's *Arte of Rhetorique*.

[5] Pages 4, 5. In quotations from the English of the period the use of *v* and *u* has been modernized, and the long *s* has been abandoned.

[6] A direct translation of Cicero *De oratore* i. 32, quoted above.

then nature. . . . . Againe, those that have good wittes by Nature, shall better encrease them by arte, and the blunt also shall bee whetted through arte, that want Nature to helpe them forward.

This gives an analysis of five co-ordinate topics: (1) "wit and aptnesse" (*ingenium* or *natura*); (2) "He must to his Booke" (*lectio*); (3) "practice" (*exercitatio*); (4) "Follow the wise men" (*imitatio*); (5) "arte" (*ars*). Wilson seems to have read both Cicero and Quintilian previous to writing this section, but he depends more on Quintilian for his recommendation that the student should imitate the wise men, and that art is a surer guide than nature. Renaissance electicism again seems responsible for his juxtaposition of the latter statement with Cicero's insistence that nature is of greater importance because eloquence was not born of art, but art of eloquence. Not recognizing the logical soundness of the classical division into *natura, ars,* and *exercitatio,* Wilson elevates *imitatio* and *lectio,* parts of *exercitatio,* to become co-ordinate with the first three. Apparently the first to depart from the classical precedent in thus making a fivefold division, he gives an example for Jonson to follow in his fivefold division. Furthermore, in Wilson as well as in Jonson, *exercitatio* is taken to mean practice or exercise instead of exercises, or *progymnasmata.*

The dearth of good teachers of rhetoric in the Middle Ages and in the early Renaissance, combined with the later rediscovery of the classic authors, led to an increasing dependence on *imitatio* as an aid to the acquisition of rhetorical skill, especially in the command of style. Petrarch jotted notes of approval in the margin of his Quintilian x. 1. 112; x. 2. 27, where imitation, especially of Cicero, is enjoined.[1] But Petrarch always wrote like himself; Barzizza, Longolius, and Bembo, on the other hand, made a creed of the slavish imitation of the style of Cicero. They reasoned that one could learn to write only by imitation, that one author only could be imitated with profit, that the one should be the best, that the best was Cicero.[2] Erasmus wrote his *Ciceronianus* (1528) to combat this heresy. But he does not carry his hostility to the abuse so far as to condemn imitation outright. He thinks it a good exercise for young students,

[1] P. de Nolhac, *Pétrarque et l'humanisme* (new ed., Paris, 1907), II, 92.

[2] Th. Zielinski, *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte* (3d ed., Leipzig, 1912), pp. 179–86.

if it is not confined to one model. Cicero himself should be imitated, but only when the student has already studied the rules of rhetoric.[1] Erasmus, in other words, corrected a pedagogical exaggeration and showed that imitation was only one means to gain oratorical effectiveness. But the heresy survived and flourished. Sadoleto, in his *De pueris recte instituendis* (*ca.* 1532), referred the whole rhetorical education of the boy, both for theory and for imitation, to Cicero,[2] and Ben Jonson would have the inspired poet learn to write verses as the schoolboy learned to write Latin—by imitating one man. Roger Ascham, however, was the most important English Ciceronian. In a letter to John Sturm, in December, 1568, he gives a good example of his theory:

> Namque, ut in vitae et morum sic in doctrinae et studiorum ratione omni, longe plus possunt exempla quam praecepta. In illarum vero rerum sive arte, sive facultate, quae sola imitatione perfici videntur, praecepta aut nullum aut perexiguum habent locum, quum exempla isthic vel solitaria plane regnant.[3]

Imitatio, not *ars*, is to Ascham the royal road to eloquence. In the same letter he asserts as well that the object of imitation should be Cicero, but the manner of imitation should be, not that of Longolius, ridiculed by Erasmus in his *Ciceronianus*, but that of Sturm. According to Sturm imitation should not be limited to words and phrases but should be "a vehement and artistic application of mind."[4] This comes from Quintilian. In the section on imitation in the *Schoolmaster* (1570), Ascham develops his theory at greater length. He defends himself against objectors by asserting that Cicero imitated Aristotle for the material of the *De oratore*, and Plato for his dialogue form. Neither of these statements is, of course, true. As to whether one or many should be followed he says, "All, for him that desires to know all." "But in everie separate kinde of learnyng, and studie by it selfe ye must follow closelie a few, and chieflie some one."[5]

Not until the seventeenth century did any rhetorical scholar correct these Renaissance vagaries. Combining good judgment with

[1] *Opera omnia*, I, 1024 D.

[2] Translation by E. T. Campagnac and K. Forbes (Oxford, 1916), p. 98.

[3] G. G. Smith, *Elizabethan Critical Essays* (Oxford, 1904), I, 347.

[4] Spingarn, *Literary Criticism in the Renaissance* (New York, 1899), p. 131.

[5] Smith, *op. cit.*, I, 22.

sound classical scholarship, the Dutchman Gerardus Joh. Vossius revived the more logical analysis in his *De rhetoricae natura et constitutione, liber* (1621).[1] His analysis is as follows: "Rhetorice quoque tribus comparatur: Natura, quae incipit; arte, quae dirigit; & usu, qui perficit" (VIII). And lest we make the mistake that every Renaissance rhetorician had previously made, of making imitation co-ordinate, he adds: "Porro tribus illis, quae ad artem requiri diximus, nonnulli adjiciunt imitationem: eosque inter magister Herennianus. Verum ea usus, sive exercitationes, pars est: nisi quis arti subjicere malit" (VIII). Vossius also agrees with Cicero and Quintilian in his evaluation of nature, art, and exercise:

> Quamquam ad comparandam eloquentiam nihil absque natura ars possit; multum autem absque arte valeat natura: tamen ne iis quidem, qui a natura caeteris sunt feliciores, nedum ingeniis mediocribus, negligendam esse artis culturam: cum orator consummatus, nisi ex utroque, produci non possit (IX).

Vossius was at one time in England, and his work may have come to Jonson's eye, but it is evident that Jonson did not profit by it.

The literary critics, as distinct from the rhetoricians, were of two kinds: the simon-pure Platonists, who postulated inspiration as the fount of poetic creation; and the neo-classicists, who constructed their theory of poetry by the square and rule of rhetoric. The inspirational theory is best illustrated by quotations from E. K., Spenser, and Drayton. In the "Argument to the October Eclogue" of the *Shepheards Calender* (1579), E.K. writes as follows:

> Poetrie . . . . being indede so worthy and commendable an arte; or rather no arte, but a divine gift and heavenly instinct not to bee gotten by laboure and learning, but adorned with both; and poured into the witte by a certain Ἐνθουσιασμὸς and celestial inspiration.

And in the poem Pierce speaks:

> O pierlesse Poesye! where is then thy place?
> If nor in Princes pallace thou doe sitt,
> (And yet is Princes pallace the most fitt,)
> Ne brest of baser birth doth thee embrace,
> Then make thee winges of thine aspyring wit,
> And, whence thou camst, flye backe to heaven apace.

Lodge in his *Defence* (1579) as a Platonist recognized the difference between poetic and rhetoric in his version of the proverb

[1] Hagae, *Comites apud Adrianum Vlacq*, 1648.

"*Poeta nascitur, Orator fit:* as who should say, Poetrye commeth from above, from a heavenly seate of a glorious God, unto an excellent creature man; an Orator is but made by exercise." He tells how Ennius is said to have become a poet by sleeping on Parnassus and dreaming that he received the soul of Homer into him.[1] Jonson may well have read Lodge for this story, as well as Persius *Prologus* i, which appears to be the source. But Jonson does not believe in becoming a poet by this method. It is too easy. Drayton in his *Epistle to Henry Reynolds* (1627) shows himself in complete agreement as to the inspiration of poetry:

> Next *Marlow*, bathed in the *Thespian* springs,
> Had in him those brave translunary things
> That the first poets had, his raptures were
> All ayre and fire, which made his verses cleere;
> For that fine madnes still he did retaine,
> Which rightly should possesse a Poets braine [ll. 105–10].

The classicists in literary criticism take the very opposite view. Vida's *Art of Poetry* (1520–27) has the genuine rhetorical flavor. He admits that not all have the same ability:

> Verum non eadem tamen omnibus esse memento
> ingenia [I, 354–55].

But he immediately asserts that cultivation and teaching may overcome even natural disability. Nature is controlled by art:

> Saepe tamen cultusque frequens, et cura docentum
> imperat ingeniis, naturaque flectitur arte [I, 362–63].

This is about as far from the Platonic doctrine of poetrical inspiration as a critic may get.

Another classicist is the Bohemian Jesuit, Jacob Pontanus, whose *Poeticarum institutionum* (1594),[2] according to a prefatory note, is based on Aristotle, Plutarch, Horace, Scaliger, Viperanus, Minturno, Robortelli, Vida, Cicero, and Quintilian. He says in his preface that no one would try to write orations without studying the art of rhetoric, yet people try to write poetry with neither ability not preparation. He begins his treatise by an exposition of the inspirational theory of poetry but shows more sympathy with the

[1] Smith, *op. cit.*, I, 71.

[2] Libri tres (Ingolstadii, ex typographia Davidis Sartorii, 1594).

familiar rhetorical point of view. "Ars tanquam certissima dux viam demonstrat: quam si fideliter sequemur, nunquam offendemus" (I, 1). *Natura*, he believes, is the first and most important element, but, to reach perfection, to it must be added *ars*, *labor*, *exercitatio*, and *imitatio*. Imitation is of great importance. The poet should imitate one man. "Unum praecipue tibi deligito, cui te similem esse studeas" (I, 10).

Although Jonson's fivefold analysis evidently does not derive from Pontanus, yet there is evidence that Jonson compiled paragraph 130 with the *Poeticarum institutionum* open on his desk. M. Castelain has shown that Jonson quotes Aristotle and Plato not from the original but from Seneca. Similarly Jonson quoted several other classical authors not from the sources but from Book I of Pontanus. At the beginning of the paragraph Jonson writes: "And these three voices differ, as the thing done, the doing, and the doer; the thing fain'd, the faining, and the fainer; so the *Poeme*, the *Poesy*, and the *Poet*." M. Castelain quotes a similar differentiation from Scaliger, but the following version from Pontanus shows a closer affinity to Jonson: "ut poema, poesis, poeta haec tria differant . . . . quasi dicas factum, factio, factor: aut, fictum, fictio, fictor" (I, 7). Again, "For, whereas all other Arts consist of Doctrine, and Precepts: the *Poet* must bee able by nature, and instinct to powre out the treasure of his mind," is from Cicero *Pro Archia*, quoted by Pontanus as follows: "caeterarum rerum studia, & doctrina & praeceptis constare: poetam natura ipsa valere, & mentis viribus excitari" (I, 1). Here as elsewhere Jonson is not attempting a close translation but is adapting as best serves his turn. Next the story that Virgil licked his verses into shape as a bear is said to lick her cubs, traced by M. Castelain to Donatus, as well as the ascription to Scaliger as to Virgil's method of writing, is in Pontanus, I, 16. As to methods of imitation Jonson says, "Not to imitate servilely, as Horace saith, and catch at vices for virtue." Pontanus quotes Horace to that effect, "Notatuit Horatius. . . . . Quod autem vitia tanquam virtutes imitantur" (I, 10). Jonson further says that a poet should cull the excellencies of other poets, digest them, and make them his own as a bee gathers sweets from flowers and makes honey. This idea, which M. Castelain has shown to be originally

from Seneca, is also furnished by Pontanus in the same chapter. Finally, Jonson writes, "For, as Simylus saith in Stobaeus," and quotes two lines of the Greek[1] with the following paraphrase: "Without Art, Nature can nere bee perfect; &, without Nature, Art can clayme no being." Pontanus gives the same Greek text—"Simyli apud Strobaeum"—and the following translation closer than the Greek to Jonson's English:

> Sine arte nusquam omnino natura est satis,
> Nec ars adempta natura quidquam potest [I, 1].

Other resemblances between Pontanus and Jonson include the doctrine of both that the poet should imitate one man, and the method of both in starting with the Platonic theory of inspiration and then shifting to the rhetorical position of the classicists.

Like Spenser and the Platonists, Sir Philip Sidney has a high opinion of poetic gifts, but primarily he is a classicist: he derives from the Italian critics, who derive from the classical rhetorics. In his *Apologie* (*ca.* 1583, imp. 1595) he says:

> A Poet no industrie can make, if his owne *Genius* bee not carried unto it: and therefore is it an old Proverbe, *Orator fit, Poeta nascitur*. Yet confesse I alwayes that as the firtilest ground must bee manured, so must the highest flying wit have a *Dedalus* to guide him. That *Dedalus*, they say, both in this and in other, hath three wings to beare it selfe up into the ayre of due commendation: that is, Arte, Imitation, and Exercise. But these, neyther artificiall rules nor imitative patternes, we must cumber our selves withall, Exercise indeede wee doe, but that very forebackwardly: for where we should exercise to know, wee exercise as having knowne: and so is our braine delivered of much matter which never was begotten by knowledge.[2]

This is the familiar rhetorical analysis with new modifications: (1) genius (*ingenium*); (2) arte (*ars*); (3) imitation (*imitatio*); (4) exercise (*exercitatio*). Imitation as in the *Ad Herennium* and in the creed of the Ciceronians is co-ordinate instead of a part of exercise. The proportional metaphor of Student is to Training as Field is to Farmer is an echo of Quintilian the rhetorician. Exercise, recommended as a preparation for writing, is of course inherent in rhetoric from its inception.

Between Sidney and Jonson there are no English writers on the art of poetry who give anything like a complete analysis. Most of

[1] *Greek Anthology*, LX, 4. [2] Smith, I, 195.

them have a high opinion of natural ability. In his *Short Treatise* (1584), James VI, of Scotland, says, "For gif Nature be nocht the cheif worker in this airt, Reulis whilbe bot a band to Nature . . . . : quhair as, gif Nature be cheif, and bent to it, reulis will be ane help and staff to Nature."[1] His "Sonnet Decifring the Perfyte Poete" requires "ane rype ingyne, reasons, wordis, memorie, skilfulnes and figuris, quhilks proceid from Rhetorique." This needs no comment to bring out the rhetorical bent. Nash, both in his own writing and in his *Anatomie of Absurditie* (1589), shows his belief in even the vagaries of natural talent. He makes a perfunctory bow to rhetoric, which he holds "in highest reputation." He then adds, "Endevour to adde unto arte Experience: experience is more profitable voide of arte then arte which hath not experience."[2] Puttenham likewise thinks little of art and much of natural talent. If the poet use art, by which Puttenham means artificialities, he should conceal it. His attitude is well exemplified from the third book of his *Arte of English Poesie* (1589): "And yet I am not ignorant that there be artes and methods both to speake and to perswade . . . . by which the natural is in some sorte relieved . . . . I say relieved in his imperfection, but not made more perfit then the natural."[3] It is interesting to find the dear enemies, Nash and Harvey, in substantial agreement on one topic at least. Although Harvey thinks more highly of discipline than does Nash, they both rate experience higher than theory: Harvey writes in the fourth of the *Fouer Letters* (1592):

> To excell, ther is no way but one: to marry studius Arte to diligent Exercise: but where they must be unmarried, or divorced, geve me rather Exercise without Arte then Arte without Exercise. . . . . A world without a Sunne; a Boddy without a Soule; Nature without Arte; Arte without Exercise—sory creatures.[4]

The evidence speaks for itself. Poetic and rhetoric, the two arts of literary communication, were recognized by Plato and Aristotle to be two—the useful art of rhetoric demanding of its practitioner natural aptitude, mastery of theory, and exercise; the fine art of poetry demanding something higher. The Latin literary critics, true to the spirit of their race, minimized the inspirational and

[1] Smith, *op. cit.*, I, 210.
[2] *Ibid.*, I, 334–35.
[3] *Ibid.*, II, 190.
[4] *Ibid.*, II, 236.

amplified the rhetorical elements in their practice and theory of poetry. The Middle Ages, cut off from contact with classical antiquity, was mentally chained by grammar, logic, and rhetoric, the *artes* of the trivium. Hawes is an illustration. Then, when the critics of the Renaissance were first quickened into intellectual life, it was by their heritage not from Greece but from Rome. Thus the battle between the *autores* and the *artes* which ensued was a struggle after all between two rhetorical points of view. The *autores* furnished models to be imitated; the *artes* formulated frigid rules to be followed. This struggle is exemplified by the disputes which culminated in *Ciceronianus*. The next two stimuli came from Greece. Aristotle's *Poetics* was set up as a body of rules by the Italian critics, who, rigid in their rhetorical shackles, ignored his sane admission that a poet must be gifted by nature or have a strain of madness in him. The result was the classicism of Vida, Sidney, Pontanus, and Jonson. The second stimulus was Platonism, insisting that the poet must be inspired from heaven and that nothing else really matters. This romantic idea was seized upon by Spenser, E. K., and Drayton. The effect of these influences has been shown. Saturated as Jonson was with Latin culture, with which his mind was so closely sympathetic, his theories of poetry were naturally those of the Italian classicists. But classicist though he was, like Pontanus he conjoins the Platonic doctrine of inspiration to the rhetorical analysis of the orator and calls the incongruous result the "Requirements of the Poet."

DONALD LEMEN CLARK

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

"TO PRUNE" AND "TO PRIME."

The *NED* leaves the derivation of *prune*[1], used of a bird trimming, "preening," its feathers with its beak, and of *prune*[2], to lop trees, etc., undecided. Both have the earlier forms *pruin*, *proin*. In the *Modern Language Review*, January, 1911, the late Professor Skeat showed that *prune*[1], earlier *proin*, is OF *poroindre* (Godef.), intensive of *oindre*, "to anoint," while *prune*[2] represents an unrecorded OF **porroignier*, intensive of *rogner*, to clip, VL *ROTŬNDIARE. With regard to *prune*[1] I may point out that the following passage is conclusive as to the etymology and original sense of *prune*[1]: "She [the hawk] *proynith* when she fetchith oyle with her beke . . . . and anoyntith hir fete & hir federis" (Book of St. Alban's).

The same book contains further statements to the same effect. With regard to *prune*[2] I may say that I suggested the Skeat etymology to the late Sir James Murray when he sent me the *NED* proofs, pointing out that the OF forms *prõoignier*, *proignier*, *progner* were parallel to those of *rogner*. But Sir James thought that it involved "a somewhat violent treatment of the first syllable." However, *proffer*, OF *porofrir*, intensive of *offrir*, is, as Skeat points out, a precisely similar contraction.

The *NED* recognizes as verbs *prime*[1], to load (a ship), recorded for 1523 (Gavin Douglas), and regards to *prime* a gun as the same word; *prime*[2], to enter on first phase, etc.; *prime*[3] (dial.), to prune trees; *prime*[4], to leap (of a fish). Omitting *prime*[2, 4], I wish to suggest that to *prime* a gun is not identical with *prime*[1], though there may have been association between them, e.g., as when we say that a man is *primed* with information or liquor. In the sense of loading a ship *prime* may be connected with nautical *primage*, allowance made to the master of a ship, Med.L. PRIMAGIUM. The analogy of *keelage*, *bottomry*, suggests that *primage* may be connected with obs. It. *primo* (*sc. legno*), keel (Jal, *Glossaire nautique*). The *NED* thinks that *prime*[3], to prune, may be a corruption of *prune*[2], *proin* (for the vowel cf. *rile* for *roil*). The following extracts

seem to show that this is true of *priming* a gun, an operation which may, I imagine, have originally consisted in clearing the touchhole. The passages are not quite so early as the first *NED* record for the word (1598), but they have the advantage of being the actual words of men "on the spot," while the earlier *NED* record is from a theoretical treatise: "Rawlins having *proined* the tuck-hole, James Roe gave fire to one of the pieces" (Purchas, *Pilgrims*, VI, 168, in Maclehose's edition, Glasgow, 1905). "Thirty muskets ready laden and *pruned* . . . . sixty powder-pots matched and *pruned* . . . . eight pieces of ordnance ready *pruned*" (*ibid.*, X, 337).

It seems possible that *prime*, in this sense, may be for **prine* (*proin*), or that it originated as a misprint of *prune*. If this is so, *prime*[1] in the *NED* requires dividing into two separate words.

ERNEST WEEKLEY

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE
NOTTINGHAM, ENGLAND

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

The Mystic Vision in the Grail Legend and in the Divine Comedy. By Lizette Andrews Fisher. New York: Columbia University Press, 1917. Pp. x and 148.

"The quest of the Holy Grail," said Hagen, "is one of the most alluring undertakings in the entire field of philology." One readily understands why Miss Fisher should have succumbed to the spell (see p. 31). But it is also one of the most difficult, and a glance at the present dissertation shows that the "chance of finding the master clew" (if such a clew really exists) is not as close at hand as Miss Fisher seems to think. The new quester—we borrow the symbolism which she herself suggests—has zeal and deals with an interesting point, namely, the doctrine of transubstantiation in relation to the two works she discusses, but whether she has brought the problem nearer to a solution we leave it to the reader of this review to judge. Not content with expounding the mystic vision in the Grail, a question certainly worthy of an orderly and scholarly discussion on the basis of a critical examination of the extant *texts*, Miss Fisher extends her theory to the *Divine Comedy*, to be sure "without any undue desire for classification" (p. 28), yet also without any seeming misgiving as to the possibility of adequately treating two such problems in the course of a brief study.

The book has an introduction (pp. 1–7), a chapter on "Transubstantiation in History, Theology, and Devotion [?]" (pp. 8–29), a chapter on the "Grail" (pp. 30–85), a chapter on the "Divine Comedy" (pp. 86–117), several appendixes, consisting mainly of citations from mediaeval Latin writers (pp. 118–39), a bibliography of "useful" books[1] (pp. 140–45), and an index (pp. 146–48). It contains five full-page illustrations, the most interesting being those of the patens of Imola and St. Denis, though where there is so much adornment one misses the finely executed miniature of the eucharistic Grail to be found in MS 120 of the Bibliothèque Nationale. The binding is in the usual attractive manner of the Columbia Studies in English and Comparative Literature. Despite the Romance subject, indebtedness to the Romance faculty at Columbia is nowhere expressed.

Miss Fisher sees in the developed Grail legend a combination of the story of Joseph of Arimathea and a quest of Celtic origin. She affirms (p. 32) that "the motive for the combination of two such elements, as far from each

[1] *DuCange's Dictionary* heads the list!

other in character as in origin, has never been adequately explained." And her thesis is that "Robert de Borron, or a writer in Latin prose whose work was adapted to romantic purposes by de Borron, desiring to set forth the doctrine of transubstantiation and to establish certain local claims, combined the story of the quest with that of Joseph of Arimathea, derived from Christian legend." The first statement is not consistent with the facts: all those who have held to the theory of Celtic origin have seen in the Christianization of the Grail a part of a general mediaeval movement in which not only pagan customs but also pagan beliefs and myths were given a Christian character. Josaphat is a Christianization of the Buddha: why? because it aided the proselyting spirit of the age so to consider him. Likewise the Grail, whether blood-vessel or dish of plenty, given its supernatural character, was identified by the relic-loving church with the receptacle of Christ's blood, the cup of the Last Supper, and the Eucharist. See Nutt, *Legend*, p. 255; Heinzel, *Gralromane*, p. 178; Martin, *Parzival*, II, p. L; Nitze, *PMLA*, XXIV; Brown, *Modern Philology*, XIV, 65. As for the second statement or the thesis proper, its validity would hinge on showing (1) that it was Robert or his supposed Latin source who first gave the Grail its Christian character, and (2) that the *Metrical Joseph* reveals a definite interest in the doctrine of transubstantiation. To these, other considerations are attached which will be brought out below.

Obviously, neither of the foregoing points can be solved without a detailed examination of the Grail texts involved. This Miss Fisher nowhere gives. Not only does she ignore the knotty problem of the authenticity of Robert's extant text, but in a rambling discussion (p. 44) of the poet's personality Bédier comes in for a view which he would probably disavow, while Suchier's theory that Robert was a knight (*ZrP*, XVI; cf. Foerster, *Wtb*, p. 173*: "Da R. Ritter war, kein Geistlicher") is not even adduced. In addition, the *Didot-Perceval* is again listed as the prose rendering of a lost romance of Robert's, regardless of the excellent arguments to the contrary by Sommer in *Beihefte* 17 and by Bruce, *Romanic Review*, IV, 462; the *Parzival* is referred to in Bartsch's, not the standard Martin edition; no mention is made of Loth's translation, now in the second edition, of the *Peredur*, which is said to be preserved" in *a* MS" (there are eleven); the *Sir Percyvelle* is rated as "the most authentic form of the original Celtic tale" on the basis of a view expressed in 1883; no adequate idea is given of the *Perlesvaus;* no attention is paid to the cyclic redactions, on which so much has been written by Wechssler, Sommer, Brugger, Bruce, and others, and Crestien's *Conte del graal* figures only in the Potvin text and not in the now revised reprint of B.N.f. 794 by Baist.

Thus, it is not surprising that the reader gets no consistent account of the characteristics of the Grail as found in Crestien and in Robert. Yet it is quite clear that some such discussion must precede any hypothesis that

Robert or the author of his source is the person who Christianized the Grail, for Brown maintains in his recent study (*op. cit.*, p. 401) that "so far as we can see, the entire connection of the Grail with the eucharistic feast and its later identification with the cup of the Last Supper sprang from these few lines of Chrétien (vss. 6379–93)," while Foerster (*Wtb.*, p. 173*, not mentioned by Miss Fisher) is just as certain that "wie die Sachen liegen, kann Roberts Josef Kristians *livre* gewesen sein," and (p. 158*) "er ist der älteste, einfachste und kürzeste unter den Graltexten . . . . [p. 178*] ob Abendmahlschüssel oder Blutschüssel, bei Josef ist beides vereint." In a recent article on the word *graal* (*Modern Philology*, XIII, 681) the question of Christianization was left in abeyance until we shall have a critical edition of the *Joseph* and the complete variants of the Grail passages in Crestien's poem. Until then no one will be able to say with any approach to accuracy who was first responsible for the Christian concept of the Grail.

As for the doctrine of transubstantiation, Miss Fisher gives an adequate, if not complete, account of its history. At the same time, "Paschasius, a monk of Corbey" (p. 15) is hardly an apt appellation of Radbert, surnamed Paschasius,[1] the famous Benedictine of Corbie; his important treatise (*De corpore et sanguine Christi*) is not named; the account of Berengar should have been fuller; see Gröber, *Gr.*, II, 1, 226; Hildebert of Lavardin, also known as Hildebert of Tours, in many ways the most important person treated, has no date, his connection with Brittany is not mentioned, nor does the bibliography give Dieudonné's book on him (Paris, 1898); the treatment of Hugh of St. Victor seems scanty, especially since the summary on page 26 would lead the unwary to infer that he was one of the "mystics of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries," etc. But, above all, the relation of transubstantiation to the Grail texts needs to be set in a clearer light if the theory is to carry conviction.

As it is, Miss Fisher points out the importance of the Lateran Council in 1215 for the establishment of this doctrine—and, generally speaking, 1215 is the date of the great florescence of the Grail story; on pages 58 ff. she discusses with considerable acumen the varying concept of the word "chalice," and she wisely stresses the importance of Robert's "secret words" (pp. 53 ff.). But she fails to note Heinzel's reference (*op. cit.*, p. 89) to "die ganze Auffassung des Gralcults als einer Art Messopfer mit Transsubstantion und Communion," the idea that any Christian writer would necessarily borrow this element, ultimately, from Latin mediaeval literature (Birch-Hirschfeld, *Sage*, p. 221), and, particularly, that it is always possible that the significant passage in Robert was interpolated into the second redaction (Heinzel, *loc. cit.*). Thus, the facts, as far as we know them, are these: Although the *Perlesvaus* in one place represents the Grail as "all in flesh," and in another, not mentioned by Miss Fisher, as in the shape of a

[1] The full name does not occur until p. 76.

"chalice,"[1] this romance clings to the view that the holy vessel is a blood relic; and it is not certain, to use Heinzel's words, "ob der Verfasser darunter die Abendmahlschüssel verstand." Crestien gives two rather different accounts of the *graal*, the first of which is in distinctly pagan surroundings (cf. Nitze, *Elliott Studies*, I), the second apparently much Christianized (cf. Brown, *loc. cit.*). Finally, Robert's text, granting for the sake of argument that it is *not* a reworking, simply compares the Grail service with the mass but does not identify them (*Modern Philology*, IX, 319).

In short, the process of Christianization is gradual, and transubstantiation, as pointed out by Heinzel, is an incident in the process, and not, in our opinion, the prime motive.

But Miss Fisher argues that in combining the "Celtic tale" with the legend of Joseph of Arimathea Robert also had the motive of establishing "certain local claims." These relate, of course, to the well-known association of the Grail story with Glastonbury Abbey. In settling these claims, however, on Robert, Miss Fisher is oblivious of the literature on this subject (Zarncke, *Paul u. Braunes Beiträge*, III, 317; Baist, *ZrP*, XIX, 320, and *Prorektoratsrede*, p. 15; Nitze, *Modern Philology*, I, 247; Lot, *Mélanges d'histoire brétonne*, pp. 267 ff.; Weston, *Quest of the Holy Grail*, p. 61; and Brugger, *ZFSL*, XXXI, 169, note).[2] These references would have shown that the *Perlesvaus* had a greater share than the *Joseph* in establishing the Glastonbury connection. The entire episode of Arthur's visit to the Chapel of St. Austin, with which the *Perlesvaus* begins, is found in Johannis Glastoniensis and not merely the excerpt given by Miss Fisher in Appendix VI; and the same episode is also used in the interesting *Histoire de Foulke Fitz-Warin* (ed. Michel, p. 110). Had Miss Fisher fixed upon the *Perlesvaus*, with its strongly allegorizing tendency, and the historical connection of Glastonbury and Fécamp, which she mentions but does not develop (p. 53), instead of Robert, we believe she would have seen the Grail development in a clearer and truer perspective.

Thus, while Robert's *Joseph* is of great importance, a proper understanding of it and the other Grail texts rests on a first-hand knowledge of the material they contain and the scholarly discussion with regard to them. To fall short of this ideal serves only to confuse a problem long recognized as one of the most puzzling in all literature.

With regard to the *Divine Comedy*, Miss Fisher's thesis is that Beatrice on her appearance in the earthly paradise symbolizes the Eucharist, and that the procession of the earthly paradise is modeled on the Corpus Christi

[1] See Evans' translation, II, 112. Gietmann, *Ein Gralbuch*, gives a very useful exposition of the allegory in the *Perlesvaus*.

[2] Baist thinks that the original *Perlesvaus* was also the source of Robert; compare the list of views given in *Modern Philology*, XIII, 682, n. 3. On all this see now "The Glastonbury Passages in the *Perlesvaus*," *North Carolina Studies in Philology*, XV (1918), 7 ff.

procession. Miss Fisher admits (p. 107) that "this whole conception of the mystic procession, and especially that of the place of Beatrice in it, is disturbing, almost shocking, at first presentation." It is furthermore untenable.

What Beatrice symbolizes we may learn with complete assurance from the last chapter of the *De Monarchia*—perhaps the most important passage in all Dante for the general understanding of his view of life:

> Duos igitur fines Providentia illa inenarrabilis homini proposuit intendendos; beatitudinem scilicet huius vitae, quae in operatione propriae virtutis consistit, et per terrestrem Paradisum figuratur; et beatitudinem vitae aeternae, quae consistit in fruitione divini aspectus ad quam propria virtus ascendere non potest, nisi lumine divino adiuta, quae per Paradisum coelestem intelligi datur.
>
> Ad has quidem beatitudines, velut ad diversas conclusiones, per diversa media venire oportet. Nam ad primam per philosophica documenta venimus, dummodo illa sequamur, secundum virtutes morales et intellectuales operando. Ad secundam vero per documenta spiritualia, quae humanam rationem transcendunt, dummodo illa sequamur secundum virtutes theologicas operando, Fidem, Spem scilicet et Caritatem. Has igitur conclusiones et media (licet ostensa sint nobis haec ab humana ratione, quae per philosophos tota nobis innotuit; haec a Spiritu Sancto, qui per Prophetas et Hagiographos, qui per coaeternum sibi Dei Filium Iesum Christum, et per eius discipulos, supernaturalem veritatem ac nobis necessariam revelavit) humana cupiditas postergaret, nisi homines tamquam equi, sua bestialitate vagantes, in camo et freno compescerentur in via.

Later in the same chapter (line 78) the word *revelata* is used to replace the two words *documenta spiritualia*.

Just as Virgil symbolizes the *philosophica documenta* by which we are guided to the lesser blessedness, symbolized by the earthly paradise, so Beatrice symbolizes the *documenta spiritualia* or *revelata* by which we are guided to the supreme blessedness, symbolized by the heavenly paradise.

And the words *haec a Spiritu Sancto . . . . revelavit* convey perfectly the essential symbolism of the procession in the earthly paradise. Divine truth is revealed through the Holy Spirit, the sacred writers, Christ, and his disciples. The persons of Dante's procession are the candlesticks, which represent the Holy Spirit; the elders, representing Holy Writ; the Griffin, representing Christ; the four creatures, representing the evangelists; and the virtues, whose relation to the scheme of blessedness is sufficiently defined by Dante within the passage quoted.

Quo vero, illa falsa. Miss Fisher's arguments are faulty both in process and in detail.

Her general reasoning as to the resemblance of Dante's pageant to the Corpus Christi procession is singularly weak; for she offers no satisfactory evidence to indicate that Dante ever saw a Corpus Christi procession and no satisfactory evidence as to the character of early Italian Corpus Christi processions. The Corpus Christi procession was authorized in 1311 by the

council of Vienne. As to its earlier existence, Miss Fisher (p. 95) reports only an unverified statement by Martène (1763–64) that "contemporary books of ritual show that the procession followed very closely on the institution of the festival," and a priori opinions expressed by Catalani (1738–39). For her description of Corpus Christi processions she relies on Martène, on Picart (1733–39), and on Kirchmaier's account (1570) of a procession in the England of his day; and she asserts other traits (p. 92) for which she cites no authority. Ritual processions of various sorts were common enough in the Middle Ages; and the establishment of Miss Fisher's thesis would have required her to show that the procession of the earthly paradise corresponded with early Italian Corpus Christi processions in their specifically differentiated character; but this is quite beyond her power.

Miss Fisher makes much of the fact that the Bull of Urban, by which the festival of Corpus Christi was established, mentions the rejoicing of Faith, Hope, and Charity in a manner suggesting the dance of these virtues in Dante. But if one reads the whole passage (p. 94) from the Bull the resemblance loses its distinctness:

> Tunc enim omnium corda et vota, ora et labia, hymnos persolvant laetitiae salutaris; tunc psallat fides; spes tripudiet; exultet charitas; devotio plaudat; jubilet chorus; puritas jucundetur. Tunc singuli, alacri animo, pronaque voluntate conveniant sua studia laudabiliter exequendo, tanti festi solemnitatem celebrantes.

And Dante, it may be remarked, nowhere mentions either Urban or the Corpus Christi festival.

Miss Fisher gives no evidence of familiarity with the bibliography of the *Purgatorio* beyond references to Vossler, Symonds, and Moore—an omission that would go far in itself to discredit her work. She has, however, found mention of different theories as to the symbolism of Beatrice (p. 101):

> Why, for example, is Beatrice the central figure? It has been said that she here personifies revelation, or the authority of the church, or the ideal papacy. It is never safe, of course, to claim a single, exclusive meaning for any part of Dante's allegory, and Beatrice may figure all of these, but not one of them accounts for her sudden descent into the midst of such a procession. In any of these characters her fitting place would be within the chariot at its first appearance, but Dante becomes aware of her presence only after certain ceremonies of ritual significance.

It is never safe to assume vagueness in the mind of Dante; and it is eminently fitting that the symbol of revelation should appear after ceremonies of ritual significance.

W. A. NITZE
ERNEST H. WILKINS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Ossian en France. Par P. VAN TIEGHEM. (Bibliothèque de littérature comparée.) Paris: F. Rieder & Cie., 1917. Tome Premier, pp. 441. Tome Second, pp. 544.

Dr. Van Tieghem's dissertation, *Ossian en France*, is an excellent example of the type of comparative literary study which has recently met with such favor at the hands of scholars in France. The author, whose *Mouvement romantique* appeared in 1912, is a ripe scholar, and his present work, prepared under the direction of Fernand Baldensperger and with the counsel of Gustave Lanson, admirably fulfils its avowed purpose of describing "l'histoire du succès et de l'influence d'Ossian en France, depuis les premières traductions des *Fragments* publiés par Macpherson juspu'à nos jours." *Ossian en France* is the most complete study yet made of the Ossianic vogue in any European country. For the influence of *Ossian* upon English literature, there is nothing at all comparable to it.

By examining a host of reviews and minor publications, as well as the works of professional critics, scholars, and poets, the author has traveled the only sure and safe road to a just estimate of the attitude of the French spirit toward the supposed ancient Celtic epic and its imitators. In his effort to measure public interest in *Ossian* and Ossianic characters he has even extended his researches to 640 catalogues of private libraries, to various inventories, and to baptismal registers. As regards the history of *Ossian* after its introduction to French readers, the scope and thoroughness of the investigation is evidenced by adequate documentation. Works referred to by short titles are enumerated in a classified bibliography of forty pages at the end of the second volume. Among the important editions of *Ossian* might well be mentioned L. Jiriczek's *James Macpherson's Fragments of Ancient Poetry (1760): In diplomatischen Neudruck mit den Lesarten der Umarbeitungen* (Anglistische Forschungen 47), Carl Winter, Heidelberg, 1915. The typography of *Ossian en France* is excellent, and misprints are rare. The index unfortunately includes only names of persons and anonymous works.

Dr. Van Tieghem's method of presentation is at first chronological, but in studying the period of maximum enthusiasm he follows the more illuminating classification by categories, and he finally traces in parallel lines the facts which mark the decadence of interest. Turgot, Suard, Diderot, the mysterious critic of the *Journal des Savants* for 1764, Romantic notions regarding bards, the confusion between Scandinavians and Celts, Northern Antiquities, Anglomania, Original Genius, the Oriental Style, Nature Poetry, Blair, Cesarotti, Wertherism, Le Tourneur, La Harpe, Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, Evan Evans, Gray, Baour-Lormian, the *Ossian* of Hill-Smith, Napoleon, *Ossian* in the *Variétés Littéraires*, Ossianic *romances*, operas, and pictures, Charles Nodier, *Obermann*, *Ossian* and Stendal, Chateaubriand, Mme de

Staël, parodies on Ossian, Lamartine, the "Christian Ossian," *Ossian* and Scott, *Ossian* and the Encyclopedists, French pilgrimages to the Highlands, Leconte de Lisle, La Villemarqué, Celtomaniacs, Renan, contemporary Celtic scholarship—these and many other persons and matters are discussed either because they throw light directly on the subject under discussion or because they acted as intermediaries between Ossianism and other literary fashions.

Although the streams that fed the great current of Romanticism are too multitudinous to be traced to any one fountainhead, the learned origin of much eighteenth-century criticism cannot be denied. The so-called Return to Nature has been recently shown to owe much to discussions of a purely philosophical character (cf. C. A. Moore [University of North Carolina], *Studies in Philol.*, XIV [1917], 243 ff.), and no account of the Romantic interest in ballads and epics should neglect the early scholarly theories regarding primitive society and the origin of language and of poetry. The new Romantic structure rose upon a foundation quarried from the ancient classics, and *Ossian* looks back to Homer for its justification. Theories such as those set forth in Thomas Blackwell's *Enquiry into the Life and Writings of Homer* (1735) (cf. *Oss. en Fr.*, I, 245), in Robert Wood's *Essay on the Original Genius of Homer* (1769), as well as in Robert Lowth's *De sacra poesi Hebraeorum praelectiones* (1753) (cf. *Oss. en Fr.*, I, 203), did much toward establishing in Europe a critical faith in what Gibbon calls "the pleasing supposition that Fingal lived and that Ossian sang." *Ossian* was admirable because it illustrated even better than Homer the current theories regarding the infancy of the human race and the rhapsodies of the primitive bard unspoiled by civilization. Dr. Van Tieghem touches upon critical estimates reflecting theories such as those indicated above, but it is to be wished that in a dissertation of such wide scope as his the learned beginnings of Ossianic criticism had been treated more fully and consecutively. Suggestive observations on the influence of Homeric scholarship on literary criticism during the eighteenth century are to be found in Richard Volkmann's *Geschichte und Kritik der Wolfschen Prolegomena zu Homer* (Leipzig, 1874), pp. 1 ff., and in Georg Finsler's *Homer in der Neuzeit von Dante bis Goethe* (Leipzig, 1912), *s.v.* "Ossian."

Prefixed to the first book of *Ossian en France* is an Introduction of ninety-two pages designed to give "une fois pour toutes et d'avance, tous les renseignements sur les poèmes ossianiques nécessaires pour comprendre de quelle oeuvre on raconte ici la fortune en France." This Introduction is of prime importance, because it is, as the author declares, "destinée à rendre le reste intelligible," and, since Dr. Van Tieghem has been forced to survey "de seconde main" a field full of pitfalls even for the initiated, it is permissible to offer a few suggestions regarding the sources and content of this survey of Ossianic literature.

Page 8. Dr. Van Tieghem asserts that "l'Irlande et les montagnes de l'Ecosse ont été habitées de temps immémorial par des populations qui parlaient et qui ont parlé jusqu'à nos jours un idiome celtique appelé le *gaélique*." As to the language of the most ancient inhabitants of the north of Scotland, we know too little to justify dogmatism (cf. T. Rice Holmes, *Ancient Britain and the Invasions of Julius Caesar* [Oxford, 1907], pp. 409 ff.). An oft-demanded explanation of the localization in Scotland of an epic cycle admitted to have originated in Ireland would be furnished by the statement that, although intercourse between the two countries may go back to the second century after Christ, the chief influx of Irish-speaking population into the district now included by Argyleshire and the neighboring territory took place about A.D. 500, and that constant communication between Ulster and the north of Scotland lasted for centuries afterward (cf. Macbain, "Excursus" to W. F. Skene's *The Highlanders of Scotland* [Stirling, 1902], pp. 385 ff.). The language of the earliest Scottish manuscript of Ossianic poems, dating from the beginning of the sixteenth century, is scarcely distinguishable from late Middle Irish (Stern, *Ztsch. für celt. Phil.*, I [1896–97], 296). These facts explain how the Gaels of Scotland came to inherit the traditions of the sister-island.

The authority for the definition of the OI *scél* (pl. *scéla*, *u*) should be page 320 or page 349 of Volume I of D'Arbois' *Cours* instead of page 46, where no mention is made of the word. According to Dr. Van Tieghem the *scéla* were "chants," "poèmes," sung to the accompaniment of the harp. Though Irish literature, especially during the later period, furnishes numerous examples of *scéla* in verse, by far the larger proportion of those preserved from the earlier period are narratives in prose or in prose interspersed with lyrical or lyrico-narrative passages. The verse portions *may* have been sung or chanted to the accompaniment of some musical instrument. The oldest Irish form of the word usually translated "harp" is *crott* (*s.v.*, Meyer, *Contributions to Irish Lexicography*), the dative form of which occurs in the eighth-century Würzburg glosses (D'Arbois, *Cours*, I, 56); Dr. Van Tieghem gives *crotta*. The form *cruith*, given by the author as Irish, is a late formation.

Dr. Van Tieghem's broad generalizations regarding the ancient Irish *bárd* and *file* require modification, especially in view of the common misapprehension regarding the position of the former. In early Goidelic literature it is the *file*, not the *bárd*, who figures prominently as a poet and man of letters. Bards are mentioned several times by early classical authorities on the Gauls, and the word *bairtni* ("bardic compositions") is found in Irish before the end of the ninth century. In early Ireland the bard seems clearly to have been "eine niedriger stehende Art von Dichtern" more or less despised by the learned *file* (Windisch, *Ir. T.*, Extraband, p. xlv). According to the *Senchus Mór*, or Ancient Laws of Ireland, the *báird* neither learn nor teach, therefore the bard's honor price is only half that of the *file*. Another

passage in the same document, quoted from another manuscript in O'Donovan's Supplement to O'Reilly's Irish *Dictionary*, defines *bárd* as "a man without any law of learning except his own intellect," a designation which, originally intended as derogatory, might well have been mistaken by later writers as evidence that the early Celtic *bárd* was a "nature-poet," such as Homer was imagined to have been (cf. D'Arbois, *Cours*, I, 48, 73). In historic times the Irish *báird* flourished most abundantly from the thirteenth to the seventeenth century. These vagrant minstrels were everywhere welcome among the Irish population, and by singing the glories of the past so fed the national antipathy to English rule that it became necessary to pass numerous laws for their suppression (E. Hull, *Text Book of Irish Literature*, I [Dublin, 1906], 198 f.). A similar situation appears to have existed in Wales, as every student of the sources of Gray's *Bard* knows. In Ireland, in Wales, and in the Highlands the bard became a romantic figure, at least in part, because he represented a lost cause. The Romantic conception of the Celtic bard was doubtless fostered also by the uncritical use of suspicious Welsh evidence furnished by Edward Williams (Iolo Morganwg) and those of his ilk (cf. Dottin, *La Relig. des Celtes* [Paris, 1908], p. 10).

Page 10. The so-called Mythological Cycle of early Irish literature, which Dr. Van Tieghem, following the traditional view, calls "le plus ancien," is really a scholarly patchwork composed of a modicum of early myth imbedded in a mass of learned pseudo-history invented by professional antiquarians after the formation of the kernel of the Ulster and Ossianic cycles.

To the list of authorities who have opposed Zimmer's theory that the Ossianic cycle did not take shape until after the Scandinavian invasion (795) should be added the observation that the German scholar's views are now entirely discredited. The matter has been at last settled by John MacNeil (*Duanaire Finn*, [I.T.S.] [1904] [London, 1908], pp. xxiv ff.) and by Kuno Meyer in the introduction to his *Fianaigecht* (*R.I.A., Todd Lect. Ser.*, XVI [1910]), to neither of which Dr. Van Tieghem refers. The author also fails to note that there is reason to believe that *MacCumaill*, the usual form of Finn's patronymic, was originally *MacUmaill* (Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. xxi). For a proper understanding of the origins from which the Romantic conception of Finn's warrior band arose it is important to add that the term *fiann* at first signified "a driving, pursuing, hunting," that it was later used as a common noun meaning "a band of warriors on the warpath," and that only at long length did it become a proper noun applied specifically to Finn's company of hunters and fighters (cf. Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. v ff.). The name "Fenians" seems to be a late eighteenth-century formation without historical justification. There is abundant evidence that Finn's was only one of many *fianna* existing in ancient Ireland, and MacNeil, in order to account for the puzzling lack of early manuscript evidence for the existence of the Ossianic

cycle, has constructed an ingenious and illuminating, though apparently not yet fully accepted, theory that the epic grew out of a feud between the *fianna* of the older subject races of Leinster and Connacht, and that hence it was late in finding favor with the dominant aristocracy who compiled and recorded the national tradition. The earliest preserved story about Finn dates from the eighth or perhaps the seventh century, but most of the manuscript accounts are of a much later time. Nothing that Dr. Van Tieghem could have included in his Introduction would have been more instructive than this view, which for the first time places the Ossianic *scéla* on the same footing as other popular epics and explains how accounts of merely local events developed into a national cycle.

Page 11. The list of references to Ossianic material in England prior to the time of Macpherson might be considerably extended. See *Report of the Committee of the Highland Society of Scotland* (1805), pp. 18 f., 21, note; Croker, *Popular Songs of Ireland* (London, 1839), p. 54; Saunders, *Life and Letters of James Macpherson* (London, 1894), pp. 102 ff.; Stern, *Ztsch. für vergl. Littgesch.*, N.S., VIII (1895), pp. 143 f. Information regarding Finn was also accessible in Lynch's *Cambrensis Eversus*, published at St. Malo in 1662 (see ed. of 1848, I, 485); in O'Flaherty's *Ogygia* (London, 1677) (see the Eng. trans. of 1793, I, 217; II, 246); and in Keating's *Foras feasa ar Éirinn* (c. 1634), of which there appeared in 1723 a partial English translation by Dermod O'Connor, said to have been reprinted several times during the eighteenth century. A second edition, in 1726, is referred to by Best (*Bibliog.*, p. 255). It is O'Flaherty and Keating whose work Macpherson attacks with such "incroyable impudence" (*Oss. en Fr.*, I, 88). For an account of other early books dealing with the Gaels see Victor Tourneur, *Esquisse d'une histoire des études celtiques* (Liège, 1905), pp. 72 ff.

Page 12. Alfred Nutt, upon whose work Dr. Van Tieghem leans rather heavily both here and elsewhere, cannot be regarded as the best authority in matters touching the date of early Irish documents. The investigations of Meyer (*op. cit.*, pp. xvi ff.) prove that as early as the seventh century after Christ heroic tradition had begun to accumulate around the name of Finn, and that by means of linguistic criteria a continuous stream of Ossianic tradition can be traced in Ireland from the seventh to the fourteenth century. Much Ossianic material is contained in manuscripts dating from the nineteenth century, though most of the stories there found are included also in earlier collections. For *Lebor na hvidre* read *Lebor na hUidre*.

Page 13. The account of the Father-and-Son Combat which is found in the ancient Irish *Aided Ainfir Aife*, and which in some form furnished the suggestion for Macpherson's *Carthon* (l'un des plus célèbres des petits poèmes: *Oss. en Fr.*, I, 33), occurs not only in the fourteenth-century *Yellow Book of Lecan* (mentioned by Dr. Van Tieghem) but also in the sixteenth-century MS, *H.3.17* (T.C.D.). Editions and translations not referred to by Dr. Van

Tieghem are accessible in *Ériu*, I, 113 ff., 123 ff. The Irish story belongs to the Ulster cycle, but a ninth-century burlesque version in which Finn and Oisín are the chief figures was published by Meyer (*op. cit.*, pp. 24 ff.). Although the Ossianic poem cannot have been the source of Macpherson's *Carthon*, it is important as proving that Macpherson was not the first to connect with Ossian material usually associated with the Ulster cycle.

The longest Ossianic document yet discovered, the *Acallamh na Senórach* ("Colloquy of the Old Men"), which Dr. Van Tieghem knows only through the Lismore version (*Oss. en Fr.*, I, 68), is found in at least four respectable manuscripts, from which it has been excellently edited by Whitley Stokes (*Ir. T.*, IV, Heft 1 [1900]). The compilation dates probably from the end of the thirteenth or the first half of the fourteenth century (Stern, *Ztsch. für celt. Phil.*, III, 614; cf. *Mod. Phil.*, XII [1915], 596, n. 3). A newly unearthed version discovered in the Royal Irish Academy is to be edited for the Irish Texts Society. If an adequate notion of the extent of early Irish and Scottish epic literature is to be reached, D'Arbois' *Catalogue*, upon which Dr. Van Tieghem depends so largely throughout his Introduction, must be supplemented by more recent accounts of manuscript finds. Although still useful, the book, it should be recalled, was compiled in 1882 and largely from second-hand sources. For additional information on Irish and Scottish Gaelic manuscripts see especially Donald Mackinnon, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Gaelic Manuscripts in Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1912; S. H. O'Grady, *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts* (in the British Museum), London (Unfinished); and the addenda and corrigenda to D'Arbois' *Catalogue*, enumerated by Best, whose *Bibliography of Irish Philology and Printed Irish Literature* (National Library of Ireland, Dublin, 1913), pp. 56 ff., should be consulted for other catalogues.

Page 14, notes 1 and 2. One of the most important collections of Ossianic poems, the early seventeenth-century *Duanaire Finn*, which is apparently known to Dr. Van Tieghem only through Stern's brief reference (*Ztsch. für vergl. Littgesch.*, N.S., VIII, 81), has been partly edited and translated by MacNeil in the volume referred to.

Page 15. Whatever sins literary and moral Macpherson may have to answer for, the common opinion (reflected by Dr. Van Tieghem) that the author of *Ossian* is solely responsible for confusing the Ulster with the Ossianic cycle needs modification. Characters and situations from the two cycles are occasionally found together in the same modern Irish folk-tale, and Miss Hull apparently has reason for believing that a similar condition existed in the Highlands and Western Isles during the eighteenth century (*A Text Book of Irish Literature*, I, 24). Cf. Stern, *Ztsch. für vergl. Littgesch.*, N.S., VIII, 80, 151. Later (p. 92) Dr. Van Tieghem puts the matter more accurately, but his statement based on p. 67 of Stern's work finds no justification in that place.

Misled by the hasty generalizations of others, Dr. Van Tieghem, following Campbell (of Tiree), characterizes the Finn of popular literature as "un *nobleman* et un *gentleman* dans la vieille et pure acception de ces mots." The fact is that the Finn of early tradition is far more genuinely epic than such a modern conception would imply. He is valorous, generous, and courteous, but he is also subtle, vindictive, "never wholly placable, and sometimes well-nigh treacherous" (MacNeil, *op. cit.*, p. xlix). The Finn whom Dr. Van Tieghem compares to Arthur and Charlemagne is scarcely more like the Finn of the best Irish tradition than is Macpherson's.

Page 19. For *Oisin in Tir na n'Og* read *Oisín i n-Tír na n-Óg*, or better still *Laoidh Oisín air Thír na n-Óg*.

Page 20. In discussing the work of Jerome Stone, Dr. Van Tieghem has fallen into a number of errors which seem to have resulted from the misinterpretation of second-hand sources. According to Dr. Van Tieghem the brilliant young schoolmaster of Dunkeld "faisait l'éloge de la poésie gaélique dans le *Scots Magazine* du 15 novembre 1755." "Dans le même recueil," continues the author, "il publiait, en janvier 1756, la traduction d'un poème non ossianique, la *Mort de Fraoch*, et, en mai de la même année, celle d'un poème ossianique qu'il intitulait *Albin et Mey*." The truth is that Macpherson's eulogy was dated, not published, November 15, 1755. Embodied in a letter to the editor of the *Scots Magazine* and accompanied by an English version of a Gaelic ballad on the death of Fraoch, it was printed in 1756 on page 15 of the January number of the eighteenth volume of that journal. The English poem, which immediately follows the letter, is entitled *Albin and the Daughter of Mey: An old tale, translated from the Irish*. No poem headed *Albin and Mey* or the *Death of Fraoch* appeared in the *Scots Magazine* for May, 1756. The *Death of Fraoch* and the poem which Dr. Van Tieghem calls *Albin and Mey* are really one, the former being the correct designation of the original. Mey is the notorious Queen Medb, who figures prominently in the ancient Irish epic of the *Táin Bó Cúailnge*. In substituting an imaginary Albin for the original hero Fraoch, Stone appears to have anticipated Macpherson's practice of exchanging for more euphonious names the cacophonous Celtic appellations. The English is merely a free rendering into conventional eighteenth-century poetic phraseology of the well-known *Bás Fraoich*, a Gaelic ballad which had been traditional in Scotland for at least three centuries (cf. *The Dean of Lismore's Book* [Edinburgh, 1862], Gaelic Text, pp. 36, 37), and which recounts an episode in the *Táin Bó Fraoich*. The latter belongs to the Ulster, not the Ossianic, cycle, and on linguistic grounds may be regarded as "perhaps the most archaic of the longer sagas" of that group ([London] *Phil. Soc. Trans.* [1895–98], p. 79 and n. 2). Dr. Van Tieghem fails to note that the *Bás Fraoich* is only one of ten Gaelic ballads collected by the ill-fated scholar. The original of the translation in the *Scots Magazine* was extracted from Stone's papers and printed in the Appendix

to the famous *Report of the Committee of the Highland Society of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1805), pp. 99 ff., and the whole collection was published by the late Professor Donald Mackinnon in the *Transactions of the Gaelic Society of Inverness*, XIV (1889), 314 ff. Another collection illustrating the interest in Gaelic poetry before the appearance of Macpherson's *Ossian* was made by John Farquharson about 1745, but the manuscript appears to have been used to kindle fires (see the mass of evidence collected by Sir John Sinclair in *The Poems of Ossian in the Original Gaelic* [Highland Society of London] [London, 1807], I, xl ff.).

Page 22. For *Belgowan* read *Balgowan*.

Page 67. The list of references to recent publications of Ossianic literature might have been greatly enlarged and improved had the author referred to Dottin's bibliographical outline of Celtic literature in the *Revue de synthèse historique*, III (1901) and VIII (1904) (the former of which is cited elsewhere [*Oss. en Fr.*, I, 11, n. 6] in another connection), and to R. I. Best's monumental *Bibliography*, already mentioned.

Pages 85–87. The validity of Dr. Van Tieghem's conclusion that the English text of Macpherson's *Ossian* is posterior to the composition of the Gaelic text of 1807 is open to the gravest suspicion. Cogent indeed must be the reasons advanced by him who would reverse the decision of Macbain (*Celtic Magazine*, XII [1887], 252) and Stern (*Ztsch. für vergl. Littgesch.*, N.S., VIII, 62), two of the most trustworthy authorities on Celtic matters, the former perhaps the most learned of recent students of Scottish Gaelic. The question of the relative priority of the two documents cannot, it is true, be answered immediately from the unassailable conclusions of Macbain and Stern that the Gaelic of 1807 is generally un-Celtic in vocabulary, in grammar, in idiom, in phraseology, and in meter. Their results taken as a whole prove no more than that the text (some parts of which are better Gaelic than others) was composed by some person or persons who, while generally thinking in English, were attempting to write Gaelic. Certain details of the evidence, however, point strongly toward the priority of the English. For example, the paucity of Gaelic turns of phrase in the English, combined with the constant appearance of English idioms and word-order in the Gaelic, creates a suspicion that the writer of the Gaelic had the English before him. Dr. Van Tieghem asserts that common opinion regards the 1807 text as "l'oeuvre des commissaires de la *Highland Society*," who, finding only scattered notes among Macpherson's posthumous papers, translated the English into Gaelic and presented the latter to the world as Macpherson's long-promised originals. As far as the present writer is aware, this is stating the case of the opposition far too simply. The evidence (too voluminous to be presented within the scope of this review) seems to point to the following as the solution most nearly in accord with the alleged conflicting evidence. Macpherson gathered from various sources summaries of stories and even scattered texts. Some

of the latter he discarded, either because of their difficulty or because they failed to square with his epic theories; others he used as suggestions for his English. Having written the English, he proceeded, alone or with the assistance of his helpers, to revise his "originals" and to piece out the Gaelic epic which he believed or affected to believe he was restoring. It appears that most of the Gaelic that now exists was "put together," to use Macpherson's phrase, during 1784 and the succeeding years by James, alone or with the help of his better-informed kinsman Lachlan, or some of his other assistants (Macbain, *Celtic Mag.*, XII, 252), but that, owing to Macpherson's political activities and loss of interest, the work was never completed. This highly probable theory of composite authorship accounts, at least in large part, for the fact that better Gaelic occurs in *Fingal* than in *Temora* (cf. *Celtic Mag.*, XII, 250). The presence in the Gaelic of passages not found in the English—a fact which seems to have impressed both Windisch and Dr. Van Tieghem—may mean no more than that the corresponding English was omitted by Macpherson in the final draft of his epics. Of the many bits of evidence tending to show the true state of the case, may be mentioned certain Gaelic passages printed as illustrations along with early editions of the English texts but appearing in entirely different form in the Gaelic of 1807 (cf. *Celtic Mag.*, XII, 252; *Ztsch. für vergl. Littgesch.*, N.S., VIII, 58 f.). The well-recognized fact that "la traduction anglaise littérale ne ressemble pas du tout à l'anglais de Macpherson" is hardly surprising when we consider the practical impossibility, at least for Macpherson and Company, of rendering into idiomatic Gaelic ballad meter the "drunken prose" of many parts of the English text. That in no case was any Gaelic "original" written before the corresponding English it would be useless to contend, but concerning a perhaps indeterminable but certainly extremely large proportion of Macpherson's *Ossian* Macbain's decision must stand: "The Gaelic . . . . is a paraphrase of the English."[1]

As regards the history of *Ossian* in France, Dr. Van Tieghem's labors would have been greatly lightened and the development of the Ossian myth could have been more clearly traced had the author had at his disposal an account of the relative contributions of genuine and spurious Celtic material to the stock in trade of Romanticism. The nature of the Romantic interest in the past can be perfectly understood only as the result of an estimate of the part played by error—an estimate which has been attempted for Norse tradition by Professor Farley in his *Scandinavian Influences in the English Romantic Movement* ([Harvard] *Studies and Notes in Philol. and Lit.*, IX [1903]).

The two earliest attempts in France to settle the Ossianic question by reference to authentic Celtic sources are highly illuminating for the development

[1] Stern's words are: "Die nähere Prüfung des Textes des gälischen 'Ossian' lässt nicht den geringsten Zweifel bestehen, dass er aus dem englischen Originale übersetzt ist."—*Ztsch. für vergl. Littgesch.*, N.S., VIII, 62.

of popular opinion regarding ancient Celtic literature. The adverse decision of "M. de C.," set forth in an elaborately documented and relatively scholarly *Mémoire*, prepared in 1764 at the request of the editors of the *Journal des Sçavans*, produced so little effect that a few years later the very publication in which it had appeared could state that "l'antiquité des poèmes d'Ossian paraît actuellement hors de doute." Disregarding the conclusions of "M. de C.," the public gladly accepted the type of scholarship represented by the physician Terence Brady in his letter published in the *Journal des Sçavans* for 1763.[1] Brady's communication, written to establish the authenticity of Macpherson's *Carthon*, is crammed with errors drawn from a well of ignorance which Dr. Van Tieghem appears not to have sounded. On the basis of a chance reference in the English translation of Keating's *History*, published in 1723, the Irishman invents an etymology for the title and imagines an Irish source for the content of Macpherson's version of the Father-and-Son Combat. Among the "many romantic fables" about Finn, Keating mentions the *Bruighean Chaorthainn* (Rowan-tree Palace). Struck by a fancied resemblance between the names *Carthon* and *Bruin-Chartuin* (an inaccurate phonetic rendering of the Irish title), Brady asserts that the Irish story is the source of Macpherson's account, implies that it belongs to a group of narratives "presqu'aussi anciens que les Héros qu'ils célebrent," and in order to support his claim translates the title "Le Combat de Carthon."[2] The *Bruighean Chaorthainn* is a wild, rambling narrative, the plot of which has no similarity to *Carthon*. It was popular during the eighteenth century and, as Keating recognized, is a late romance of the decadent Middle Irish type.[3] It is no wonder that, fed on such pabulum, the Ossianic myth throve, especially in an age when the learned reviewer of a "*Dissertation . . . . sur une nation des Celtes nommés* Brigantes *ou* Brigants,"[4] published in 1762, spoke of Celtic as a "langue inconnue," and, content to re-echo the opinion of his author, wrote: "On soupçonne que les anciens Livres Irlandois sont écrits en Celtique"(!)

TOM PEETE CROSS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[1] The letter is printed on pp. 84 ff. of the July issue. Dr. Van Tieghem incorrectly refers to p. 426 of the June number. Cf. *Oss. en Fr.*, I, 163.

[2] Brady also informs his readers that the proper form of Finn's name is Finn OM Couel, which Dr. Van Tieghem further deforms into Fin O'Mac-Conel.

[3] One of the earliest MSS, found in the Advocates' Library in Edinburgh, is said to date from the year 1603. Cf. Mackinnon, *Descriptive Cat. of Gaelic MSS* (Edinburgh, 1912), p. 14. Pádraic mac Piarais, *Bruidhean Chaorthainn*, Baile Átha Cliath (1908), p. iii.

[4] *Journal des Sçavans* (June, 1763), pp. 292, 295.

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVI *January 1919* NUMBER 9

MARTIN PARKER, BALLAD-MONGER

Martin Parker, most distinguished of professional ballad-writers and leader of a group of lesser Caroline singers, was probably born about 1600. Nothing is known of his early life or of his family. His first extant ballads were published in 1624–25. Of the four that belong to this early period, one ("A Scourge for the Pope") is political, another ("Household Talk") is a didactic pronouncement on the evils resulting from jealousy, but the other two ("Time's Alteration" and "The Country Lass") have a lyrical lilt characteristic of Parker and almost as pleasing to students of ballads as it was to Parker's contemporaries.[1]

Of Parker's education one can judge only from his work, and ballads are printed so carelessly as almost to destroy the value of such evidence. When one brings in all the Greek and Roman Pantheon to the accompaniment of bad grammar, one is likely to prejudice one's readers! Parker's ballads and romances show a wide acquaintance with the popular literature of the day. *Bevis of Hampton*, *Tom Thumb*, *Scoggin's Jests*, and dozens of similar works formed his stock in trade. In a receptive, nay gullible, frame of mind, he read and absorbed all the available broadsides and chapbooks (which he called "chronicles"), and revamped them into "A True Tale of Robin Hood," "The Most Admirable History of that Most Renowned Christian Worthy, Arthur King of the Britains,"

[1] For these ballads, see the *Roxburghe Ballads*, I, 165, 440; II, 581; IV, 100.

and "A Brief Summary of the History of St. George."[1] Alive to the tricks and exigencies of the trade as he was, Parker had also read hundreds of ballads, traditional as well as broadside; so that, while he could imitate the traditional ballad meter in his "Tale of Robin Hood," or direct his ballads to be sung to the tune of "Sir Andrew Barton" or "Chevy Chase," he could with equal ease string together "Excellent Medleys," whereof every line "spake a separate sense" because it was chosen indiscriminately from an Elizabethan ballad as old and as popular as "Jane Shore" or from the newest song that was being cried through the streets.

In his early period Parker also reveals an interest in classical themes. In a rare effort at real poetry, he wrote *The Nightingale warbling forth her owne Disaster: or, The Rape of Philomela* (1632),[2] professedly getting his material from the sixth book of the *Metamorphoses* and astonishing even his intimate friends with this unwonted display of learning. "I. S." (whom one could wish to believe Sir John Suckling!), in complimentary verses attached to *The Nightingale*, says that translation is as meritorious as a "new creation," and prophesies,

> Henceforth so long
> As incest, murders, cruelty and wrong,
> Revenge, and sad *Erinnys* here shall dwell,
> So long this story forth thy praise shall tell.

William Reeve is equally comforting; for he assures Parker that this poem needs no "borrow'd rags of wit"

> To please the moderne fry of wit and fame:
> That bribe their Judgments with the Authors name,
> And in the title-page conclude it ill,
> Because it sprung from thy obscurer quill.
> On these set easie thoughts, her voyce shee'l raise
> To sing this unjust rape; and thy just prayse.

But Da. Price, whose verses "To his ingenious friend *M.P.* Author of this Poem" sent the Nightingale forth properly equipped in her

[1] See Child's *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, No. 154; Arber's *Transcript*, IV, 451; Eyre's *Transcript*, II, 96, 256.

[2] A unique copy of this poem was recently offered for sale among other books in the Huth library. It had been reprinted by A. Strettell in 1828 (twenty-six copies).

flight to avoid the slings and arrows of hostile criticism, tells more about Parker's training. He writes:

> I often have admir'd thy fluent veine
> Composing things of an inferiour straine;
> But neither I nor any man could looke,
> For such a piece from thee, as this thy booke.
> Wert thou a scholler then 'twere no rare newes,
> But being none can any Reader chuse
> But wonder at thy smooth and haughty stile?
> Were I not sure thou didst this worke compile,
> I'd not beleev't; tush, common sense doth show it,
> 'Tis wit not learning, that can make a Poet.
> Proceed with boldnesse then, and let men see,
> The Aganippean well doth spring in thee.

In a later work Parker shows familiarity with all the greater names in English literature, and indeed seems to be ranking himself with Chaucer, Jonson, Drayton, Wither, and Shakespeare; but he approached *The Nightingale* with much trepidation. The poem is elaborately prefaced. First comes a dedication "To the Right Honorable *Henry Parker*, Lord *Morley* and *Mount Eagle*, Baron *of Rie*," which makes one suspect that, like Bishop Percy, Parker loved to believe himself allied to a noble family. He apologizes for his boldness in dedicating "this Embrion of my weake braine" to his Lordship, because,

> knowing your noble mind to be amply replete with all these vertuous indowments, what wonder is it that I have thus adventured the Poem, for the excellency of the history (I confesse) did deserve a more skillfull penman, being a Tragedy so unpareleld, that I wonder why none of our temporary Laureats have undertaken it before. . . . . My Nightingale fearing the hissing Serpents of this envious age desires your powerfull wings to shelter her. And in lieu of your generous approbation of her song, my Muse (by you her noble *Mecaenas* animated) shall endevour heereafter with a Posie of a sweeter odour to kisse the hand of your Honour.

In his address "To the Iudicious Reader" Parker writes as if ridicule had already scathed him:

> Let *Apelles* draw his picture with never so much art and iudgement the *Cobler* will find a hole in his coate; let an Author write as learnedly as *Homer* . . . . he shall be subiect to the cavilling censure of *Zoilus;* no marvell then if I the most unperfect vassal of the Muses be scoft for my endevour, when

the best deserving Artist is not free. . . . . If my *Nightingale's song* please the honest and intellectuall man, she hath her wish, for she sings not to please knaves and fooles. . . . . I have endeavored (as her Secretary) to pen her song, with as much skill as my little learning can produce. . . . . Therefore, good Reader, for the love thou bearest to the Muses, iudge charitably now, that I may be animated to proceede to thy future profit and pleasure.

Next follow two seven-line stanzas, "The Author to his Booke, and it to him in manner of a Dialogue," and the three complimentary poems already mentioned. In the "Argument of this Poem or History" Parker retains his ballad-manner to plead that the reader will "note the morall and let the fiction passe as it is"; and in the poem itself his training in ballad-writing causes him to be self-conscious, to strain every nerve in order to make his story seem true, and to moralize in a commonplace fashion.

There are seventy-two seven-line stanzas in the poem, which begins, conventionally enough, with the author's walking to a "curious grove," where the heavenly choristers, especially the lovely Philomel, pleased his senses well. "You that will heare her song," says he, "attend to it":

> For by the figure call'd *Prosopopeie*,
> Ile tell her tale as though herselfe did speake,
> You'l pardon give, if not so well as shee
> I paint her story, for my braine's too weake
> For such a taske, yet I the ice will breake,
> That others of more learning may indevour
> Further to wade in this deepe spatious river.

The story, Parker assures us, is "wofull, wonderfull and tragicall," and at its conclusion the Nightingale remarks:

> The reason why the poet sayes wee three,
> I, and my sister, with her husband, were
> Transformed into birds, was cause that we
> Were all unworthy humane shapes to beare,
> As by our deedes prodigious doth appeare:
> The morall of the story is the chiefe,
> As for the changing formes 'tis past beliefe.
>
> Yet there's no doubt but I poore *Philomel*
> Have nothing sung but what you may believe:
> Birds seldome use any untruthes to tell,

If you'l not take my warrant I shall grieve;
Whether you doe or no let me perceive
That you all shun the vices mention'd in't,
Then i'le rejoyce because my song's in print.

The Nightingale is certainly "not remarkable for any display of imagination or poetical fancy, nor possessed of any extraordinary or striking merit," and it does indeed exhibit "merely the common run of mediocrity";[1] but Parker's work is quite as good as another *Philomela* published in 1622 by a person who is styled, both in the Stationers' Registers and on the title-page of his poem, "Patrick Hannah, gentleman."[2] Nor does it greatly suffer in comparison with Gascoigne's *Philomel*. Parker made no pretensions to gentility,[3] and he probably came to realize that his forte lay in balladry rather than in poetry.

He may have attempted *The Nightingale* because of his successes in ballad-writing during the years 1625–32. For much of his most excellent work was behind him: he had published *A Garland of Withered Roses*[4] (now lost, but doubtless modeled after Thomas Deloney's *Garland of Good Will*), as well as two prose chapbooks and fourteen ballads that can still be traced.[5] One of them, *Robin Conscience*,[6] is quite the equal of the much praised "London Lickpenny," a poem which in many respects it resembles; the others were ditties on the fall of La Rochelle, on the jolly hypocrisy of begging soldiers, on shrewish wives, henpecked husbands, distressed lovers. The books (now lost) were *An Abstract of the Histories of the Renowned Maiden Queen Elizabeth* and *An Abridgment of the Wonderful History of that Irreligious and Unchristian Knight, Sir Timothy Troublesome*. By 1632 Parker had made himself preeminent among London balladists and pamphlet-writers. As a

[1] Corser, *Collectanea Anglo-Poetica*, Pt. IX, pp. 113–14.

[2] Registered on July 5, 1622 (Arber's *Transcript*, IV, 73); reprinted by the Spenser Society, 1875.

[3] Though in late copies of "A True Tale of Robin Hood" the title-page announces that the ballad was written "by Martin Parker, gent."

[4] See Arber's *Transcript*, IV, 280, 308.

[5] Some of these have already been mentioned. For the others, see the *Roxburghe Ballads*, I, 264, 276, 622; II, 182; III, 110, 121; Pepys Collection, I, 96, 274; *Harleian Miscellany*, I, 47; Hazlitt's *Handbook* (1867), p. 440, No. 14; Arber's *Transcript*, IV, 216, 242, 272.

[6] This may have been a revision of an older ballad: cf. Arber's *Transcript*, II, 358, 405, 576, 596.

poet he was perhaps less successful. What reception *The Nightingale* had among birds of rarer plumage is uncertain, but her song must have sounded feeble to all except Parker's personal friends, and perhaps to her failure was due his relapse into hopelessly "inferior strains."

In his "Description of a Strange and Miraculous Fish, cast upon the Sands in the Meads, in the Hundred of Worwell" (1632?),[1] Parker sinks to the lowest depths of doggerel and journalism:

Full twenty one yards and one foot
This fish extends in length,
With all things correspondent too't,
For amplitude and strength. . . . .

His lower jaw-bone's five yards long,
The upper thrice so much,
Twelve yoak of oxen stout and strong,
The weight of it is such,
Could not once stir it out o'th sands;
Thus works the All-creating hands!
O rare,
beyond compare,
In England nere the like.

Surely as strange a fish as that sung of by Autolycus! Some of Parker's news-stories, however, still have value and interest. "The Honor of the Inns of Court Gentlemen, Or a briefe recitall of the Magnificent and Matchlesse Show, that passed from Hatton and Ely house in Holborne to Whitehall, on Monday night being the third of February [1633–4], and the next day after Candelmas"[2] (describing the pageant of Shirley's masque, *The Triumph of Peace*), and "A briefe description of the triumphant show made by the Right Honourable Aulgernon Percie, Earle of Northumberland, at his Installation and Initiation into the Princely Fraternitie of the Garter,"[3] are accurate in every detail, as a comparison with contemporary historians, like Whitelocke and Lord Stafford, will show.

[1] Reprinted in the old Shakespeare Society's *Papers*, 1846, XXXI, 95. Sir Henry Herbert granted licenses to "James Seale to shew a strange fish for half a yeare, the 3d of September, 1632," and to "Francis Sherret, to shew a strange fish for a yeare, from the 10th of Marche, 1635" (Malone's *Shakspeare*, 1821, XIV, 368; XV, 95).

[2] Collier's *Broadside Black-letter Ballads*, p. 112.

[3] *Roxburghe Ballads*, III, 219.

A constant stream of ballads came from Parker's pen during 1632–40. No other ballad-writer is now represented by so many extant ballads, and none was more versatile. Parker had an innate vein of poetry that usually kept him from sinking to the level of his fellow-writers, even when dealing with lugubrious and sensational subjects. Of such subjects he was evidently none too fond. It is remarkable that of the fifteen ballads that can be dated 1634, only one (the ballad on Percy) is reportorial. The others are popular songs,[1] which are quite the equal of even the choicest productions of the American rag-time crew.

Important in its results was "Saylors for my Money. A new Ditty composed in the praise of Saylors and Sea affaires."[2] Parker may have revised some old ballad, for there are entries in the Stationers' Registers of ballads entitled "the perilous paynes of poore maryners" and "the danger of Sailers and their troubles turmoile and paine," on October 13, 1579, and March 10, 1581–2.[3] His ballad beginning,

> Countrie men of *England*, who live at home with ease,
> And little thinke what dangers are incident o' th' Seas,

was slightly revised and brought up to date by some unknown writer under the title of "Neptune's Raging Fury," the exemplars of which date about 1678.[4] The first two lines, which have been changed to

> You Gentlemen of *England*, that lives at home at ease,
> Full little do you think upon the dangers of the Seas,

at once suggest England's naval ode by Thomas Campbell. Campbell frankly admitted the borrowing, publishing his ode (in the London *Morning Chronicle*, January, 1801) under the title, "Alteration of the Old Ballad 'Ye Gentlemen of England,' composed on the Prospect of a Russian War." Parker wrote another ballad as famous and as influential as "Saylors for my Money," but neither

[1] See *Roxburghe Ballads*, I, 434, 503, 581; II, 114, 142, 413, 554, 586; III, 231, 236, 242, 248, 284; VI, 695. For registrations, see Arber's *Transcript*, IV, 313, 315, 317–20, 322, 325, 327, 331; Eyre's *Transcript*, II, 61, 70, 498.

[2] *Roxburghe Ballads*, VI, 796.

[3] Arber's *Transcript*, II, 361, 407.

[4] *Roxburghe Ballads*, VI, 431; registered on July 1, 1678 (Eyre's *Transcript*, III, 67).

has sufficed to keep his own name alive. He is remembered by none but the specialist.

Only three of his productions are known to have appeared in 1636,[1] and three in 1637, the year of Ben Jonson's death. Jonson is alluded to in Parker's *Harry White his Humour*,[2] a stupid pamphlet made up of a series of inane remarks, each followed by the phrase, "This is [or is not] Harry White's humour." The pamphlet concludes with "An Applause by L[aurence] P[rice] of the author M.P.," interesting only as showing that friendly relations existed between Parker and Price, his greatest rival. Parker's "Bill of Fare"[3] is based on the coarse song, "A Strange Banquet," from Jonson's masque of *The Gipsies Metamorphosed*, and was highly commended by John Taylor, the Water Poet.[4]

Journalism returns with a vengeance in Parker's account of "Two Inseparable Brothers; Or, A true and strange description of a Gentleman (an *Italian* by birth), about seventeene yeeres of age, who hath an imperfect (yet living) Brother growing out of his side, having a head, two armes, and one leg, all perfectly to be seen. They were both baptized together; the imperfect is called *John Baptist*, and the other *Lazarus*. Admire the Creator in his Creatures."[5] On November 4, 1637, nineteen days before the ballad was registered, Sir Henry Herbert had granted "a license for six months . . . . to Lazarus, an Italian, to shew his brother Baptista, that grows out of his navell, and carryes him at his syde. In confirmation of his Majesty's warrant, granted unto him to make publique shewe."[6] In the ballad (which is properly furnished with a woodcut indisputably proving that

> A Gentleman, well qualifide, doth beare his brother at his side,
> Inseparably knit,
> As in this figure you may see, and both together living be:
> The world admires at it),

[1] See *Roxburghe Ballads*, I, 592; III, 51; Arber's *Transcript*, IV, 366, 367.

[2] Registered on May 16, 1637 (Arber, IV, 384); reprinted at Oxford in 1846 and by Halliwell-Phillipps in 1851.

[3] *Roxburghe Ballads*, I, 70; Arber, IV, 394.

[4] See "A Bill of Fare," which concludes his *Taylors Feast* (registered on November 10, 1637, just about a month after Parker's pamphlet was entered).

[5] *Roxburghe Ballads*, VIII, 26, 876; Arber, IV, 399.

[6] Quoted in another connection in Malone's *Shakspeare*, 1821, XIV, 368.

Parker declares that even the king and queen have seen and marveled at the brothers; and proof of their popularity is found in allusions to them in poems by John Cleveland and Alexander Brome.[1] If one were anxious to injure Parker's reputation, one could advance strong evidence to show that he soon outdid himself by writing anonymously a prose tract called *A certaine Relation of the Hog-faced Gentlewoman called Mistris Tannakin Skinker, who was borne at Wirkham.*[2] "The Woman Monster," "A Maiden Monster," "A Strange Relacion of a Female Monster," and "A new Ballad of the swines faced Gentlewoman," ballads licensed during December, 1639, show how keen was the interest Smithfield felt in Miss Skinker.[3]

Whether or not *Martin Parker his maruelous prognostication*, a book licensed on January 31, 1638,[4] warned its readers of the imminence of civil war, the ominous political situation was strongly reflected in his other work from 1638 to 1640. His "Briefe dissection of Germaines Affliction,"[5] a long ballad of sixty-eight stanzas, was from first to last a warning to England. Events now conspired to drive Parker to journalism, though he never wholly discarded lyrical ballads. In 1639 he wrote a ballad on a "Fearful Fight at Sea, between the Spaniard and the Hollander";[6] and five ballads in which he reviled the Scots for their share in the Bishops' Wars are extant.[7] Probably he wrote many others, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that the government encouraged him to pen these

[1] Cleveland's *Poems*, ed. Berdan, p. 123:

> The Italian monster pregnant with his brother,
> Nature's diæresis half one another,
> He, with his little sides-man Lazarus,
> Must both give way unto Smectymnuus.

Brome's Thirty-fifth Epistle, *Poems*, 2d ed., p. 244:

> We are a *miracle*, and 'tis with us
> As with *John Baptist* and his *Lazarus:*
> I thou, and thou art I, and 'tis a wonder,
> That we both live, and yet both live asunder.

Neither allusion has before been explained. Note that both poets, in contradiction to Parker and Sir Henry Herbert, name Lazarus as the "imperfect"!

[2] Reprinted in Ashbee's *Occasional Fac-simile Reprints*, No. 16; registered on December 5, 1639 (Arber's *Transcript*, IV, 492).

[3] See Arber's *Transcript*, IV, 492 f.; *Roxburghe Ballads*, VIII, 28 ff.

[4] Arber's *Transcript*, IV, 406.

[5] Registered on February 9, 1637–8 (*ibid.*, IV, 408); see Collier's *Bibliographical Account*, II, 99.

[6] *Ballads and other Fugitive Pieces from the Collections of Sir James Balfour*, pp. 8–12; cf. Arber's *Transcript*, IV, 480, 484.

[7] Three of them are reprinted by C. H. Firth in the *Scottish Historical Review*, April, 1906, pp. 263–72.

mocking ditties. All of them are rampantly patriotic; all represent (if in a crude manner) what the Royalists were thinking. It appears, however, that Parker's zeal as "the prelates' poet" carried him too far, and that he was in danger of being imprisoned. Such at least is the testimony of "Margery Marprelate."[1]

In 1638 he re-issued *Cupids College, or the Court of Complements*,[2] and published a "book" called *The Antipodes*.[3] Neither of these is extant, but perhaps their loss is atoned for by the preservation of his horror ballad on an earthquake that happened in Calabria on March 27, 1638.[4] After an enumeration of commonplace as well as gruesome details about this calamity, Parker appended a "memoriall or List of some Earthquakes and other horrible accidents which heretofore have hapned in England," to give more probability and piquancy to his story. Another lost work, *The true story of Guy, Earle of Warwicke in prose*, was licensed on November 24, 1640.[5]

By 1640 Parker had written some sixty-five ballads, romances, and prose tracts of ascertainable date, and about fifteen other ballads known to be his had surely appeared before this time. His supremacy had long been indisputable, his reputation was considerable, and it was quite natural, then, for Henry Glapthorne to make Clare, in *Wit in a Constable* (1639),[6] warn Sir Timothy:

> If upon these conditions you can like
> The match is perfect: but faith take my counsell,
> Make not your selves meere raskalls: the reproach
> To boyes and schollers, subjects fit for ballads,
> Not worthy M Ps name to them.

Thomas Nabbes, too, knew M.P., and referred to him in his comedy *The Bride* (1640).[7] After Theophilus has eloped with the woman who has come to be married to his foster-father, he asks Raven: "Cosin, the news? how go matters?" Raven replies:

> Noise fils the roomes within, and in the street
> The rabble is convented; where a jury

[1] See below, p. 461.

[2] Arber's *Transcript*, IV, 273, 301, 308, 413.

[3] *Ibid.*, 425.

[4] *Ibid.*, 419; Hindley's *Old Book Collector's Miscellany*, III, No. 12.

[5] Eyre's *Transcript*, I, 3.

[6] IV, i (*Plays*, ed. Pearson, 1874, I, 215).

[7] *Works*, ed. Bullen, 1887, II, 31.

Of wide mouth'd oyster wives, to whom the foreman
A one legg'd ballad singer opens tunably
The merry case, not onley do acquit you,
But prayse the act; and sweare a ballad of it
Would out sell all the libels ever yet
M.P. subscrib'd to.

Parker was doubtless pleased with this notoriety.

He was soon to come into greater prominence. His ballads delighted all persons save those of puritanical bent who regarded ballad-singing as ungodly. At least fifteen thousand such persons detested him! The Long Parliament met in November, 1640, and on December 11 "Alderman Pennington, with some hundreds following him, presented the Citizens Petition, subscribed by 15000, against the Discipline, and Ceremonies of the Church."[1] The petition itself was supported by "A Particular of the manifold Evils, Pressures, and Grievances caused, practised, and occasioned by the Prelates and their Dependants," of which this was Article VIII:

The swarming of lascivious, idle, and unprofitable Books and Pamphlets, Play-books, and Ballads, as namely, *Ovids* fits of Love, the Parliament of Women [which] came out at the dissolving of the last Parliament, *Barnes* Poems, *Parkers* Ballads in disgrace of Religion, to the increase of all vice, and withdrawing of people from reading, studying, and hearing the Word of God, and other good Bookes.[2]

Lord Digby, however, either did not know Parker by reputation and hence easily confused him with another writer, or else deliberately avoided using his name in the House of Commons; for in his address on February 9, 1641, he said:

Contemptible things (Sir) swarme in the 8. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. Articles of this Petition. Did ever any body think, that the gaites of *Ovid*, or *Tom. Caryes* muse, should by 15000, have beene presented to a Parliament, as a motive for the extirpation of Bishops?[3]

Thirty-three years later Andrew Marvell used the eighth article in

[1] Whitelocke's *Memorials*, 1732, p. 39.

[2] A copy of the original tract in the Harvard Library differs somewhat from a reprint that will be found in Rushworth's *Historical Collections*, Pt. III, i, 94.

[3] *The Third Speech of the Lord George Digby, to the House of Commons, concerning Bishops, and the Citie Petition, the 9th of Febr: 1640.*

the Citizens' Petition as a stinging nettle for his enemy, Dr. John Parker.[1]

Parker's reputation as "the prelates' poet" was responsible for the attack made on him in an anti-episcopal pamphlet called "*Laws and Ordinances*, forced to be agreed upon by the Pope and his Shavelings for the disposing of his adherents and the Popish Rites he sent into England":

> Article 2.—We appoint John Taylor, Martin Parker, and Herbert, all three English poetical, papistical, atheistical ballad-makers, to put in print rhyme-doggery from the river of Styx, against the truest Protestants, in railing lines; and, in the end, young Gregory [Brandon, the public hangman] shall be their paymaster.[2]

In *The Downefall of Temporizing Poets* (1641) Lightfoot says to Red-nose ("the Regent Master of all Ballad-singers," a "worthy Patron of Strangullion Poetry"):

> You [ballad-writers] are very religious men, rather than you will lose half a crowne, you will write against your own Fathers: You will make mens wills before they be sicke, and hang them before they are in prison, and cut off

[1] In *The Rehearsall Transpros'd: The Second Part*, 1673 (*Works*, ed. Grosart, III, 281–83), after various attempts to connect Dr. Parker with renegades that had borne his name, Marvell wrote: "But that which seems to come nearest home to him and the chronology of his grandfather, is in the year 1640 [the year in which Dr. Parker was born], in a petition from the city of London and several counties to the then Parliament; complaining, among other things, of Martin Parker's ballads, in disgrace of religion, to the increase of all vice, and withdrawing of people from reading, studying, and hearing the Word of God and other good books. 'Tis not at all unlikely that this, as an hereditary provocation, hath stuck upon him ever since, and that he swore at the altar, when he was but nine years old, to be aveng'd for this affront to his lineage. We see often that the signature of the grandfather revives upon the child, and, as some rivers diving for a while under ground, make a bridge of the parents to spring up again at that interval. Hence, doubtless, hath proceeded all his peek against the Nonconformists; hence that unquenchable Nemesis against the City; hence it is that he hath taken upon him to defend in gross at this time the whole mass of enormityes, right or wrong, then complained of in that petition: all this mischief for a ballad-maker's sake of the kindred. The Duke of Muscovy indeed declared war against Poland because he and his nation had been vilifyed by a Polish poet; but the author of the Ecclesiastical Politie would, it seems, disturb the peace of Christendom for the good old cause of a superannuated chanter of Saffron-Hill and Pye-Corner. But though indeed he doth not write his books in the Smithfield meetre, yet they are all blank ballad, and the subject and consequence 'to the disgrace of religion, the increase of all vice, and withdrawing people from reading, studying, and hearing the Word of God and other good books,' is exactly the same. So that he may when he will put in for letters of administration in the Prerogative Court, and enter his claim too with the Heralds; for every one will yield him to be the next-of-kin to that Author; or let him but produce his own writings, 'tis evidence sufficient."

[2] Chappell, *Popular Music*, II, 418 f. I have observed that the Herbert mentioned above has an (unimportant) allusion to Parker in his *Newes out of Islington* (1641): "Perhaps you may verifie the old proverb; what saies M. Parker? the more knave the better fortune."

heads before you know why or wherefore. You have an indifferent strong Corporation: 23 of you sufficient writers, besides *Martin Parker*.[1]

Parker's supremacy among balladists was always taken for granted by his contemporaries. Further proof—if any were needed—of this supremacy is found in *Vox Borealis*, a prose tract that describes itself as being "by way of dialogue between Jamie and Willie. Amidst the Babylonians, Printed, by Margery Mar-Prelat, in Thwackcoat-lane, at the Signe of the Crab-tree Cudgell; without any priviledge of the Cater-Caps, the yeare coming on, 1641."[2] The author (who is suspected to have been Sir John Mennis) comments on the imprisonment of the author of the ballad "Blue Cap for Me," and then remarks: "One *Parker*, the Prelats Poet, who made many base Ballads against the *Scots*, sped but *little better*, for he, and his *Antipodes* were like to have tasted of Justice *Longs liberalitie:*[3] and hardly he escaped his Powdering-Tubb, which the vulgar people calls a Prison." Why *The Antipodes*, a pamphlet at this time almost three years old, was singled out for mention is doubtful. But Parker was evidently deluging the streets with other journalistic songs in addition to his "base ballads against the Scots," for in 1641 Henry Peacham remarked that "for a Penny,

[1] Sign. A 3 *b*.

[2] There is a reprint of this tract in the *Harleian Miscellany*, III, 219.

[3] Seccombe, in the *Dictionary of National Biography* (*s.v.* "Parker"), explains "Justice Long" as equivalent to "the Long Parliament," thus investing Margery Mar-prelate (who wrote "in the year coming on, 1641") with prophetic powers. "Long's powdering-tub" seems to have been a proverbial phrase, of the use of which I have noted many other instances. A tract called *A Nest of perfidious Vipers* (*Harl. Miscel.*, V, 553) says of Wren: "Make his *Mittimus* to the *Gate-house* [a London prison], or obtain the Favour of *Long's* Powdering-Tub, which shall powder him soundly, long enough before he come forth." *The Remonstrance of Declaration of Mr. Henry Martin, and all whole Society of Levellers* (1646) says: "Presently these petty Knaves with painted staves, presently appeare and sease on us and our creatures, and transport us straight to a Justice of peace . . . . and then Mr. Justice of peace after sends us to Justice *Longes* powdering Tub." In satirical verses added to Gayton's *Pleasant Notes upon Don Quixot*, 1654, p. 288, we read, "Wee'll find a place for thee, neer justice *Longs*." In Wycherly's *Love in a Wood* (III, ii) Dapperwit asks Mrs. Crossbite if she intends to change her lodgings "to Bridewell, or Long's powdering-tub," which Ward (Mermaid ed., p. 65) explains thus: "The name of powdering-tub was applied to places where persons afflicted with a certain disease were cured" (see also the *New English Dictionary*). A disreputable Justice Long is frequently mentioned in Civil War tracts: the *Perfect Diurnall of Occurrences* (December 6–13, 1641) tells that he was arrested and sent to the Tower (he was interrogated during the following week); the *Weekly Intelligence* for October 10–18, 1642, remarks, "There was on saturday Justice *Longs* man taken following his Master with such colours (like man, like master). . . . ." But Parker interpreted Margery's remark as meaning simply that he had been imprisoned.

you may have all the news in England and other countries, of murders, floods, witches, fires, tempests, and what not, in one of Martin Parker's *Ballads.*"[1] "But now," continues Margery, "he sweares he will never put pen to paper for the Prelats againe, but betake himselfe to his pitcht Kanne, and Tobacco Pipe; and learne to sell his frothie Pots againe, and give over Poetrie."

On this passage is based the assumption, accepted by the *Dictionary of National Biography*, that Parker was a tavern-keeper. It is not improbable, and indeed seems to be supported by his familiarity with the laws regulating ale-houses and with the tricks of the trade shown by him in his *Robin Conscience*, as well as by the title of one of his works, "Certaine verses of Martin Parker against trusting to sett vp in Alehouses."[2] On the other hand, one would expect to find Parker, if he had been a tavern-keeper, defending his occupation in his reply.

He did reply, both to Margery and to other anonymous authors whose works are lost or else inaccessible to me, in a work with this astonishing title: "*The Poet's Blind mans bough*, or Have among you my blind Harpers: being A pretty medicine to cure the Dimme, Double, Envious, Partiall, and Diabolicall eyesight and Iudgement of Those Dogmaticall, Schismaticall, Aenigmaticall, and non Gramaticall Authors who Lycentiously, without eyther Name, Lycence, Wit or Charity, have raylingly, falsely, and foolishly written a numerous rable of pesteferous Pamphelets in this present and the precedent yeare, justly observed and charitably censured, By Martine Parker"![3] In the poetical preface "To the Truly Iudicious, Impartiall, Charitable, and Impreivdicated Christian Reader of what quality, age or sex soever," Parker expresses the hope that the reader will

> contented be,
> With what is Publish'd by (abus'd) M.P.
> Who never wrot but in the Iust defence,
> Of's King and Countrey; now's owne innocence.

[1] "The Worth of a Penny," Arber's *English Garner*, VI, 271.

[2] Arber's *Transcript*, IV, 367.

[3] A copy (1641) is in the Widener Collection, Harvard College; reprints are in Ashbee's *Occasional Fac-simile Reprints* and Hindley's *Old Book Collector's Miscellany*.

In the poem itself he disclaims the purpose of destroying the shameless crew of nameless authors who have attacked him: he will simply check them, for "Eagles sleight notice take when crowes doe creake." He laughs to scorn charges made against him in the *Popish Proclamation* and by one John Thomas in *Mercuries Message*. Turning to Margery, he ridicules the

> Borealist by some brother pen,
> Yet father'd on a sect to this end,
> To bring me in disgrace; as though I had,
> Bin punisht heretofore for writing bad,
> Calling me th' Prelats Poet and such tearmes,
> Which nothing but his spight at all confirmes,
> For I ne're wrot ith' Bishops cause so much,
> As now I have on this occasion touch.

What especially provoked him was the anonymity of the attacks, not only on himself but also on his friends, John Taylor and Herbert. "More danger," he remarks, "comes bith' quill then by the Sword"; anonymous attacks are cowardly, for an author's "name should iustifie what he hath done":

> This maxim I have alwaies thought upon
> What ever yet was published by mee,
> Was knowne by *Martin Parker*, or M.P.
> All Poets (as adition to their fames)
> Have by their Works eternized their names,
> As Chaucer, Spencer, and that noble earle,
> Of Surrie thought it the most precious pearle,
> That dick'd his honour, to Subscribe to what
> His high engenue ever amed at
> *Sydney* and *Shakspire*, *Drayton*, *Withers* and
> Renowned *Ionson* glory of our Land:
> *Deker*, Learn'd *Chapman*, *Haywood* althought good,
> To have their names in publike understood.

This utterance should make one very careful about attributing to Parker works that were published during his lifetime without his signature.[1] It also throws interesting light on his personal ambitions. In his postscript Parker declares:

> I have but broke the Ice, some coadiuters
> Will helpe to scourge these paper-persecuters.

[1] But many of the unsigned Roxburghe Ballads are attributed to him by Chappell and Ebsworth.

One coadjutor was John Taylor, whose satires were as numerous as they were feared. There seems to be no doubt that Parker believed himself an artist, that he had a high sense of his art and his responsibilities. Perhaps it was this feeling that made him the best balladist of his time.

The Stationers' Registers do not mention Parker from November 24, 1640, to March 25, 1658, but he must have been writing constantly. In 1643 appeared his most famous ballad, "When the King Enjoys his Own Again,"[1] known to everybody, if for no other reason, because it is sung by Roger Wildrake in *Woodstock*. It was, said Joseph Ritson, in his *Ancient Songs* (1790), p. 229,

> the most famous and popular air ever heard of in this country. Invented to support the declining interest of the Royal Martyr, it served afterwards, with more success, to keep up the spirits of the Cavaliers, and promote the Restoration of his Son; an event it was employed to celebrate all over the kingdom. At the Revolution [of 1688] it of course became an adherent of the exiled family, whose cause it never deserted. And . . . . upon two memorable occasions, was very near being . . . . instrumental in replacing . . . . [the crown] on the head of . . . . [James II's] Son. It is believed to be a fact, that nothing fed the enthusiasm of the Jacobites . . . . in every corner of Great Britain, more than "The King shall enjoy his own again."

The ballad was imitated and parodied for quite two hundred years.

Parker's reputation was meanwhile increasing. The *Actors Remonstrance, or Complaint, for the Silencing of their profession* (1643), enumerating the evils that had befallen members of the "quality," declared that "it is to be feared, that shortly some of them (if they have not been enforced to do it already) will be encited to enter themselves into *Martin Parkers* societie, and write ballads."[2] Samuel Sheppard's complaint was that

> Each fellow now that hath but had a view
> Of the learned Phrygians Fables groweth bold,
> And name of Poet doth to himself accrew;
> **M.P. That ballad maker** too is now extold
> With the great name of poet. *He that knew

[1] *Roxburghe Ballads*, VII, 633, 682.

[2] Ashbee's *Occasional Fac-simile Reprints*, No. 4, p. 7; also reprinted by F. Marshall, London, 1822, and by Hindley.

*J.T. Better far how to row, then pen to hold,
His sordid lines are sweld to such a weight,
Theyre able for to make his boat a freight.[1]

If Parker had the "great name" of poet in 1646, it was probably because he had kept himself before the public with ballads now lost or untraceable; for almost nothing that he wrote from 1643 to 1655 is known. But Humphrey Mill, writing in the same year as Sheppard, thought little of Parker's poetry. In a catalogue of articles seized from a harlot he names

A boxe of salve, and two brasse rings;
With *Parker's* workes, and such like things.[2]

In January, 1647, Charles I was sequestered in the Isle of Wight, and communication with him was made high treason. There is reason to believe that henceforth Parker's life was a hard one. Ballads continued to pour forth in great numbers, but all had to be published surreptitiously, and were attended with danger to author, printer, and singer. When ballad-singing and the publishing of anti-Parliament tracts were forbidden by the House of Commons in February, 1647, most of the ballad-writers had betaken themselves to prose tracts, the superiority of which over ballads for personal attacks and effective ridicule was just beginning to be felt. The newspaper, everybody admits, grew out of the ballad; but more significant still is the fact, usually ignored, that ballad-writers themselves wrote many of the earliest news-pamphlets. The number of Royalist pamphlets soon became so large, and their attacks on Parliament so stinging, that many laws, most of them for a time ineffectual, were passed to drive them out of existence.

From 1647 to 1650 Parker seems to have played a rôle of importance among the Royalist pamphleteers—John Taylor, Samuel Sheppard, John Cleveland, John Hakluyt, and others. Some account of his work will be found in Mr. J. B. Williams' *History of English Journalism* (1908).[3] Only the barest outline will be given here.

[1] "The Times Displayed," 1646 (*British Bibliographer*, I, 530). Not many years later Sheppard, Taylor, and Parker were to be associated in a dangerous evasion of the publishing laws.

[2] *Night Search*, quoted in *British Bibliographer*, II, 432.

[3] See also his chapter (xv) in the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, VII. Parker's part in this pamphleteering needs a thorough investigation, which (for reasons that will be obvious) it is now impossible to give.

Mercurius Melancholicus; or, Newes from Westminster and other Parts, the first of the Royalist pamphlets, was published by John Hakluyt, a Presbyterian minister, on September 4, 1647. So ambiguous were his comments on the king that (says Mr. Williams[1]) Parker challenged "his claim to write *Melancholicus* at all," eventually beat him "out of the field, and the numbers of his [own] *Mercurius Melancholicus*, which he persistently declares to be the only true and original *Melancholicus*, can generally be distinguished by the different style." In September, 1647, Parliament passed an ordinance providing for fines and imprisonment to be inflicted on the authors, printers, and sellers of unlicensed books, pamphlets, treatises, and ballads.[2] Licensed editors aided in the hunt for the Royalist writers. Henry Walker, the Puritan iron-monger, anxious to crush Hakluyt, began a *Mercurius Medicus* directed against him. The editor of *Melancholicus* replied in Hakluyt's defense, remarking that "Martin Parker it seems hath penned a very doleful ballad called Luke Harruney's [Walker's anagram] confession and lamentation at the gallowes, to the tune of the 'Earle of Essex last good-night.'"[3] No further *Mercuries* came from Walker.

On November 27 the House of Commons endowed with full powers a committee of ten (who were at liberty "to meet when and where they please") to inquire after the authors, printers, and publishers of the *Mercurius "Elenchicus," Mercurius Pragmaticus*, or any similar work, and to take special steps to prevent the publication of further pamphlets of this kind. On January 6, 1648, it ordered the committee to "constantly sit, and take Course, according to the Powers given them, to remedy the Abuses in Printing," and two days later provided for more effectual legislation to that end.[4] Mr. Williams says that on February 25 the House offered rewards for the discovery of the writers of *Melancholicus* and *Pragmaticus*, and he gives us Parker's comment on the subject.[5]

[1] *History of English Journalism*, p. 81.

[2] *Journals of the House of Commons*, V, 309, 319.

[3] Williams, *op. cit.*, pp. 87–88.

[4] *Journals*, V, 371, 420, 424.

[5] Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 92; cf. *Journals*, V, 471, and Rushworth's *Historical Collections*, Pt. IV, ii, 914–15.

Throughout the year 1648 the Royalist pamphleteers were continually being arrested. The prisons were full, but the prisoners always managed to escape.[1] The editor of *Melancholicus* (whom Mr. Williams confidently identifies with Parker) writes of having got his "foot out of the springe" at Peter House on June 26, where he had been "neere starved to death by that murdering villain Symball," and sends his "commendations to his friends there, Mr. Shepheard, John Harrison, and the rest."[2] As soon as they escaped, these men always resumed publication of their *Mercuries* or else published new ones. But Parker's fame for ballads was not overshadowed by his prose tracts. In June, 1648, *Mercurius Pragmaticus* (No. 12) attacked Rous's translation of the Psalms, remarking that discerning spirits will charge Rous with having taken Martin Parker "and such *high flying wits* of this *Reformation*, to be partners in the work." "I wonder," he adds, "the Company of *Stationers* would deprive the Corporation of *Ballad-mongers* of such a *choice peece*."

In September, 1648, Captain Bethan was made provost-marshal, with power to suppress ballads and news-pamphlets,[3] and he performed his work so thoroughly that from this date until 1656 no ballads were entered at Stationers' Hall. Accordingly, there is no record of what ballads Parker wrote during this period, though it is highly improbable that he had ceased to write. Bethan also succeeded in putting an end to most of the *Mercuries*, and such as were struggling on became even harder to publish when General Fairfax and the Parliamentary Army occupied London. One by one the papers perished. There are records of the imprisonment of Taylor, Hakluyt, Sheppard, Cleveland, and others, but not of Martin Parker. He seems, however, upon one occasion to have been placed in the pillory;[4] while *Mercurius Morbicus* informs us that in the autumn of 1647 he was hauled off to prison on his wedding-day.[5] John Taylor, almost betrayed to Parliament, prudently left London on one of those long-distance rambles which he so voluminously describes.

[1] See *Commons' Journals*, V, 666; VI, 111.

[2] Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

[3] Whitelocke's *Memorials*, p. 337.

[4] Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

[5] So Mr. Williams has informed me in a personal letter.

Returning to London on August 4, 1649, he was arrested eleven days later and imprisoned. Afterward released, he died in 1653. Mr. Williams remarks that "nothing is known of Martin Parker after this date, and he may have died in prison."[1]

The date of Parker's death is altogether uncertain. He and Taylor are referred to in *The Joviall Crew, or the Devill turn'd Ranter* (1651),[2] two of his ballads are quoted in Walton's *Complete Angler* (1653),[3] and he is rather slightingly mentioned in Flecknoe's *Miscellanea* (1653).[4] Probably he was dead in 1656, when a certain "S.F." wrote "*Death in a new dress*, or sportive funeral Elegies, commemorating the renowned lives and lamented deaths of these eminent personnages, Robbin the Annyseed-water seller, Martin Parker the famous poet, Archee the late Kings Jester"; but it should be remembered that Archie Armstrong lived until 1672. The elegy on Parker is of great interest, all the more so because it has not before been reprinted:[5]

On the Death of the most Renowned Poet,
Mr. Martin Parker
An ELEGIE

HOw has it happen'd (speak ye tardy *Nine*)
That glorious *Parker* (he whose every line
Deserves a Panegyre) has all this while
Slept like a Slave, beneath his Funeral Pile,
And no new *Johnson, Dun*, or learned *Gill*,
To Dub the distillations of his Quill,
To Canonize his Canzonets, which are
Yet extant on each Market-day, or Fair.
Spirit of *Orpheus*; *Archimedes* skill
Would fail (should he bring in his tedious Bill)
To number all thy curious Canticles,
Thy Octaves, Epiceds, and Madrigals,
Which (as was us'd of old) did kindly greet
The peoples ears, as they did pass the street;

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 113.

[2] *Censura Literaria*, 2d ed., III, 209.

[3] Walton quotes thirteen lines from Parker's "Keep a Good Tongue in your Head" and "The Milkmaid's Life" (*Roxburghe Ballads*, II, 114; III, 236), as was first pointed out by J. P. Collier (in the *Athenaeum*, August 30, 1845, p. 859).

[4] *Censura Literaria*, III, 28.

[5] Its existence has been noted only in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. The reprint here given was made from photographs of the elegy secured from the British Museum.

Sung to the pleasant Treble and the Base,
The Small or Great, the Sharp or Flat, to grace
Thy sublime Sonnets; was not every Song
Of thine applauded by the thirsty throng,
So (as to *Thracian Orpheus*) Trees did nod
When thou wert worried by the *Delphick* god;
And Stones did move; nay, gave a vocal sound,
Till with loud laughter every verse was crown'd.
Here thou wert *Pindar*, *Alceus*, *Moschus*, *Bion*
Apollos lov'd one, and the Muses Lion:
But these were but thy sports; some minutes spent
In *Mimmick* state, to palliate meriment:
Let us behold thee in thy *German* Story,
There thou art *Lucan*, while thy Muse (all glory)
Does sing the *Austrian* Ruines in a tone
More strong then *Stentors*, with O hone! O hone!
Say'st thou to *Silius*; here are other things,
The Deeds of *Pacolet*, and *Pagan* Kings:
Oh! in what stately Verse thou didst discourse on
The Doughty deeds of *Valentine* and *Orson*;
Dull Prose before, and fit for Boyes and Girles,
Thine for the solace of great Lords and Earls.
Speak ye nine Sisters, for ye only know
Whence did this sprightly sparkling Torrent flow;
How has our *Parker* above all inspir'd
His Lines so much cry'd up, so much desir'd?
I have't; He alwayes bath'd his Beak in Ale,
Toping whole Tubs off, like some thirsty Whale;
Phoebus and *Hermes* gave their joint consent
Their Priest should keep a Tippling-Tenement:
Martin might well do more then *Goffe* or *Graunger*,
Who (like a Horse) fed at the Muses Manger.
Hyperion's Host is sunk beneath his Barrels,
Ceas then your hom-bred Feuds, & stint your quarrels
Ye that pretend to be his Heirs; in Sooth-la
Ye do dishonour the deceased Youth-la;
All that ye ought to minde are Sighes and Tears,
Death-beds and Funerals, and Scriveners ears;
Weep, weep until the floud-gates of your eyes
Do drown the world for *Parker's* Obsequies.

Offering further proof of the undisputed pre-eminence of M.P. among the ballad-writers, the elegy also gives information of interest about one of his most pretentious works. Of course the German

story in which Parker is Lucan was his *Brief Dissection of Germany's Affliction*, published eighteen years earlier; but the stately verse of *Valentine and Orson*, laughingly praised by S.F., has disappeared, and S.F.'s is the first mention of it. Thomas Vere registered on March 25, 1658, "A booke called *A memoriall of those two French princes, Valentine and Orson, sons of the high & mighty Alexander the Grecian Emperour &c*, written in English heroicall verse by Martin Parker,"[1] and six days later assigned it to Francis Coles. Evidently several editions of the poem were demanded. According to Holland's *Don Zara del Fogo* (1656),[2] it was "dedicate to all the Nobles and Gentry of either Sex throughout this Nation,"—surely an odd time to dedicate a poem to the nobility, however strong were Parker's royalist sympathies. To Holland, furthermore, we are indebted for the preservation of a few lines from *Valentine and Orson*. "Duke-La-Foole," he remarks, "was armed much like that haughty and Pagan King *Feragus*, of whom the most excellent of our *English* *Poets thus sings:

*Martin Parkers Heroick Poem, called Valentine & Orson, Dedicate to all the Nobles and Gentry of either Sex throughout this Nation.	———With a Shirt of Mayle, A Helmet of strong Brass upon his head, A Shield of the same Mettal, which to fail, Was not ordain'd, a Sword two handfuls broad, instead Of ponderous Club, he bore a well-grown Oak, Which threatned certain death at every stroak."

Perhaps these lines will arouse curiosity as to Parker's idea of what constituted a "heroicall" poem rather than a desire to have the remainder of it. Holland himself had little respect for M.P. "O true and unparalell'd Amorist," he exclaims jokingly, "worthy the Pen of another Parker!"[3] Evidently Parker *was* dead in 1656; but to the jocular authors of *Naps upon Parnassus* (1658) he was still

[1] Eyre's *Transcript*, II, 170, 171.
[2] Page 174.
[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 55.

"the Ballad-maker, Laureat of London";[1] while in 1659 Alexander Brome felt obliged to lament that

> there's no other Standard but Opinion;
> Which varies still, 'cause *fancy* has dominion.
> So *Martin Parker's* laurell'd by some men,
> With as much boldness as the wise do *Ben.*[2]

The last entry in the Stationers' Registers of a new work by Parker was made on April 5, 1660, when Francis Coles licensed his *Most admirable Historie of that most Renowned Christian Worthy Arthur King of the Britaines,*[3] a quarto of twelve pages. Here Parker merely summarized all current fictions into one "true story," pinning his faith to Geoffrey of Monmouth, and declaring that Arthur's existence can no more be doubted than that of William the Conqueror. Eleven "chapters" are devoted to Arthur's life; and "when he had thus victoriously raigned 26 years," says Parker, "he rendered to death his interest, and his soule to his Redeemer in the year of Grace 543, and was buryed at Glasenbury . . . . where in this present modern age (I meane within living men's memory) there hath been an old Epitaph, with some other memorials of him found: the Epitaph (so well as I can) I think it not impertinent to render in English:—

KING ARTHUR'S EPITAPH.

> Here lyes great Arthur, Britains King,
> 'Mongst Christian worthies first of three:
> His fame throughout the world doth ring;
> None did such doughty deeds as he.
> Death all unto this passe doth bring:
> He can subdue the greatest King."

The book concludes with an alphabetical list of Arthur's hundred and fifty knights, taken "from an old Chaucerian manuscript."

Perhaps the last contemporary reference to Parker occurs in Dryden's comedy of *Sir Martin Mar-all* (acted in 1667). "There's five shillings for thee," Sir Martin tells Warner; "What? we must

[1] Sign. A 7; first noted by Brydges, *Censura Literaria*, 2d ed., III, 28.

[2] Poetical Preface to A. Brome's edition of *Five new Playes . . . . by Richard Brome.*

[3] Eyre's *Transcript*, II, 256; cf. Collier's *Bibliographical Account*, II, 102 f.

encourage good wits sometimes." And Warner scornfully replies: "Hang your white pelf: sure, Sir, by your largess you mistake me for Martin Parker, the Ballad-Maker, your Covetousness has offended my Muse, and quite dulled her."[1]

More than eighty ballads and pamphlets by Parker have survived, but fourteen works licensed under his name in the Stationers' Registers have disappeared, among them being, one suspects, the most pretentious of his efforts.[2] Nine of these are described as books; but many more ballads are undoubtedly lost or can no longer be traced to him. It is incredible, for instance, that he wrote only two ballads in 1637, but I have found no others of that date. Popularity was often fatal to the preservation of broadsides; and, as the names of authors are seldom given in the stationers' entries of ballads, the registers of the Stationers' Company cannot help one to determine what lost ballads Parker wrote.

Much of his extant work is mere compilation. His "True Tale of Robin Hood" is a résumé of various chapbooks and ballads, with perhaps a borrowing from Munday's *Downfall of Robert Earl of Huntingdon;*[3] and in his accounts of St. George, Guy of Warwick, and Valentine and Orson he was no doubt reworking old material, making little pretense at originality but content to "purge truth from falsehood." His well-known ballad of "The King and a Northern Man" seems to be a summary of old ballads and an old play now lost.[4] The signs of the original work are now almost wholly obliterated, but the version which, thanks to him, has come down to us is nearer to being a traditional ballad than anything else he wrote. His "Cooper of Norfolk," too, is a revision of an Elizabethan ballad called "A merry new Song how a Bruer meant to make a Cooper cuckold, and how deere the Bruer paid for the bargaine;"[5]

[1] V, i (pointed out by Chappell and others).

[2] Several of these have already been named. For registrations of the others see Arber's *Transcript*, IV, 290, 298, 367, 453 (cf. 427). See an inquiry about these works in *Notes and Queries*, August 12, 1916, p. 127.

[3] See Child's introduction to his ballad No. 154.

[4] See the introduction to Collier's reprint, 1841 (Percy Society's publications, Vol. I); and cf. also entries of works called "Too good to be true" and "The knittinge vppe of too good to be true" (March 31, 1580, and August 11, 1581, Arber's *Transcript*, II, 367, 400), which Collier overlooked.

[5] *Roxburghe Ballads*, I, 98; Lilly's *Collection of 79 Black-Letter Ballads*, 1867, p. 60.

and, as this older work is preserved, one can readily study Parker's methods and form an idea of how greatly he must have improved other ballads when occasion demanded their revision.

The most distinctive feature of Parker's ballads is their lyrical tone, their harmony of numbers. "The facility and the rhythmical flow of Martin Parker's metres," said Chappell, "made him the most popular ballad-writer of his time, and perhaps of his century."[1] His metrical excellence was due to the remarkably fine way in which he could fit words to the innumerable tunes that floated through his head. Some of his ballads are written in measures far too pretty for the subject-matter. In "Keep a Good Tongue in your Head," a vulgar ballad of advice for women, one almost finds real poetry:

She hath as sweet a face
As any in seaven miles space,
Her eyes christalline
Like diamonds doe shine,
She looks with a modest grace:
Her haire is like flax,
Her lips are red wax,
That seale the bond so strong
Twixt her and I,
That till I die
Ile justifie
Her constancy,
But she cannot rule her tong.[2]

But usually Parker knew instinctively (what some real poets never learn) how to choose the one meter best adapted to his subject. Although pre-eminently a lyricist, he did not scorn to sing of a monstrous fish or a deformed Italian boy; but he probably wrote ballads of this type only for advertising posters and did not dream of having them classed with his other work. In any case, like some modern writers, Parker was largely at the mercy of his publishers: he wrote what was required, and, if a scarecrow poem on the afflictions of Germany was wanted, who could put so many mournful facts and graphic horrors into such pleasant verse as M.P.? His ballads, too, are remarkably free from coarseness.

[1] *Roxburghe Ballads*, III, 51.
[2] *Ibid.*, III, 238.

After his death Parker shared the usual fate of ballad-mongers. His songs continued to delight the hearts of the common people and to bring money to publishers, ballad-singers, and ballad-revisers, while his own name was rapidly forgotten. It would, however, be almost impossible to estimate the popularity of his ballads during the hundred years that followed his death. Many of them were reprinted in Seven Dials, the nineteenth-century home of English ballads, and are still sung in England. In the technique of balladry and in tunefulness of verse Parker has had no equal among professional ballad-writers before or since his day. Collier's tribute to him is just: "Surely those who love poetry, and who sometimes unreasonably expect to meet with it in old ballads of a comparatively modern date, must be satisfied with this sweet, cheerful, pastoral vein of Martin Parker . . . . [who] was a much better poet than many give him credit for . . . . though he wrote for bread, and wrote to please the vulgar."[1]

HYDER E. ROLLINS
Lieutenant in the United States Army

[1] *The Athenaeum*, August 30, 1845, p. 859.

NOTES ON BURNS'S FIRST VOLUME

Burns's first volume, as is well known, appeared on July 31, 1786, at Kilmarnock. It contained a varied offering of "Poems, chiefly in the Scottish dialect,"[1] and presented specimens of virtually all the kinds of writing that Burns had attempted to date. Examples of his satiric power were "The Holy Fair" and "The Twa Dogs"; "The Cotter's Saturday Night" and "Hallowe'en" showed him in the rôle of describer of Scottish manners; "To a Mouse" and "To a Mountain Daisy," with others only less well known than these, witnessed his skill in the portrayal of nature and his debt to the sentimentalists; seven epistles, the best known of which is probably that to Lapraik, gave proof of his command of a form which was not only well established in Scottish literary tradition, but nicely fitted to Burns's own powers; a group of English poems—"To Ruin," "The Lament," and the like—showed him in his least happy vein; and to round out the volume there appeared four songs and a miscellaneous collection of "epitaphs." There were in all forty-four poems, furnished with explanatory footnotes and a glossary and introduced by the well-known and unnecessarily apologetic preface. The notes which follow are based on a study of the photogravure facsimile of this volume, published at Kilmarnock, 1909, by D. Brown and Company.

I. OMISSIONS FROM THE VOLUME

For some time before the appearance of the book Burns had been considering publication. Witness stanza 7 of the "Epistle to James Smith":

> This while my notion's ta'en a sklent
> To try my fate in guid black prent.[2]

[1] Thus the title of the volume. The facts concerning its publication are given succinctly in the *Centenary Burns*, I, 311. Additional matters of interest, including Burns's accounts with the printer, are in Chambers, *The Life and Works of Robert Burns*, I, 349.

[2] *Facsimile*, p. 71. Here, as throughout the volume, the name of a living person is merely indicated by initials and an appropriate number of asterisks: "To J. S. * * * *" Names of the Deity and profane expressions are similarly disguised.

That he hoped to make money by the venture, despite the disclaimers both in "Proposals for Publishing" and "Preface," is equally obvious.[1] In the assignment of his personal estate to his brother Gilbert, made "to enable said Gilbert Burns to make good his engagement" to "aliment, clothe, and educate" Burns's acknowledged daughter, child of Elizabeth Paton, Burns makes special reference to "the profits that may arise from the publication of my poems, presently in the press."[2] Furthermore, the volume appeared at a time when Burns was in local disrepute, and, as he put it, "skulking from covert to covert, under all the terrors of a jail,"[3] because of action taken or threatened by Jean Armour's father. In view of these facts it was but common sense for Burns to plan his volume so that it would appeal to his audience, thus replenishing his pocket-book, and at the same time avoid wanton offense to the orthodox establishment. Accordingly one is prepared to find that Burns has picked and chosen with a great deal of care and that some of the most pungent products of his early years have been excluded. A consideration of the exact extent of Burns's omissions, however, may throw a little new light on the question of his attitude toward his public and on the literary taste of this group for which he was printing.[4]

The omission of six satires, two of which are among Burns's most powerful productions, is not hard to explain. "The Twa Herds," "Holy Willie's Prayer," and "The Address of Beelzebub" were so caustic and personal that Burns excluded them from all the editions whose publication he supervised.[5] "Death and Dr. Hornbook," "The Ordination," and the "Address to the Unco Guid" found place in the first Edinburgh edition of 1787, but not in its predecessor.

[1] In the first place he writes (*Works of Robert Burns* [ed. Wm. Scott Douglas. London: Wm. Patterson & Co., 1891. 6 vols.], IV, 113. Hereinafter referred to as Scott Douglas), "the author has not the most distant mercenary view in printing"; in the second (*Facsimile*, p. 5), "not the mercenary bow over the counter."

[2] Scott Douglas, IV, 136. In the autobiographical letter to Dr. Moore he states that he pocketed "near twenty pounds."

[3] *Ibid.*, IV, 18.

[4] The chronological data in the *Centenary*, Scott Douglas, and Ritter, *Quellen Studien zu Robert Burns* (Berlin, 1901), make it reasonably certain that the poems I list as omitted from the Kilmarnock edition had actually been composed before July, 1786.

[5] According to the *Centenary*, the poems appeared first in 1796, 1799, and 1818, respectively (II, 315, 321, 388).

When the Kilmarnock volume came out, Burns was already known locally as a satirist; he gave his friends a fair sample of his power in "The Holy Fair" and at the same time he avoided too direct a challenge to the ecclesiastical pack by omitting the poems certain to give greatest offense.

Ten more or less formal literary epistles which had already been composed[1] would have been superfluous in view of the fact that the volume already contained seven examples of the type. Similarly, the omission of a group of English poems, five of which[2] later appeared in the first Edinburgh edition, may be sufficiently accounted for by the fact that this sort of work was amply represented. For the omission of "A Poet's Welcome to His Love-begotten Daughter" and "Adam Armour's Prayer" there were cogent reasons. And that the group of elegies and epitaphs printed in the Kilmarnock volume was too large rather than too small is evidenced by the fact that when Burns was gathering material for the Edinburgh volumes he not only added no new poems of this sort, but actually omitted three that had already appeared.

The most notable poem that failed to find place in the Kilmarnock volume was "The Jolly Beggars,"[3] and here again the poet's

[1] "To Davie" (second), "I Am a Keeper of the Law," "To John Goldie," "To James Lapraik" (third), "To John M'Math," "The Inventory," "To John Kennedy," "To Mr. M'Adam," "I Hold It, Sir, My Bounden Duty;" "To Dr. McKenzie."

[2] "Stanzas Written in Prospect of Death," "Prayer: O Thou Dread Power," "Paraphrase of the First Psalm," "Prayer under the Pressure of Violent Anguish," "The Nineteenth Psalm Versified." The appearance of these in the first Edinburgh edition is evidence of the shifts Burns was put to in order to give an appearance of newness to the second publication.

[3] The belief that "The Jolly Beggars" was written before July, 1786, rests on a paragraph in Chambers' *The Life and Works of Robert Burns*, I, 180. Chambers includes the poem among the works written at Mossgiel, in 1785, and notes that "the poem is understood to have been founded on the poet's observation of an actual scene. . . . . In the course of a few days, he recited a part of the poem to Richmond, who informed me that, to the best of his recollection, it contained, in its original complete form, songs by a sweep and a sailor, which did not afterwards appear." Chambers thus appears to have had his information from Richmond, who had his from Burns himself. Scott Douglas (IV, 98) calls attention to a paragraph in the first commonplace book, under date of October, 1785, which might suggest that "The Jolly Beggars" had been composed "at this very period," and notes also, what is more significant, that Richmond, Chambers' informant, "removed from Mauchline to a situation in Edinburgh about Martinmass, 1785." The suggestion in the *Centenary* (II, 304) that "'The Jolly Beggars' may be the piece referred to in the letter to Richmond, 17th February, 1786," is of little importance. Burns writes only this: "I have inclosed you a piece of rhyming ware for your perusal" (Scott Douglas, IV, 107). It should be noted that according to Chambers the published work was not precisely what Richmond heard in 1785.

action is quite understandable. It was considered too "free," not only for the Kilmarnock, but for the various Edinburgh editions as well. Currie rejected it as unprintable even after Burns's death, and Cromek omitted it from the *Reliques*.[1] Incidentally it is not uninteresting to note that the society which could not tolerate the frank language of Poosie Nansie's taproom admitted without question the venereal argot of the epistle to James Smith.

It is when one turns to the songs in the Kilmarnock edition and compares the four which Burns printed with the many which he allowed to remain in manuscript that one first meets any real difficulty in accounting for his actions. One of the four, "It Was upon a Lammas Night," is a somewhat spirited reminiscence of

> that happy night
> Amang the rigs of barley;

but the others have virtually nothing to commend them. Why should the poet have selected this reworking of an old song, the "Farewell" to the Tarbolton lodge, "Now Westlin Winds," and "From Thee, Eliza, I Must Go," as the only examples of his lyric power and have allowed "Mary Morrison" and "Green Grow the Rashes" (to mention only two of the many which he could have chosen) to remain unprinted?[2] Certainly not because he himself was without a liking for Scottish songs. By the time his book was ready for the press he had written some forty that have been preserved, and it is hardly conceivable

[1] *Centenary*, II, 305.

[2] The exact date of some of Burns's songs has never been determined, but there is little doubt that the following were in existence before the Kilmarnock volume went to press: "John Barleycorn," "My Nannie, O," "No Churchman Am I," "When Guilford Good," "Green Grow the Rashes," "Handsome Nell," "O Tibbie, I Hae Seen the Day," "I Dream'd I Lay," "A Ruined Farmer," "Montgomery's Peggy," "In Tarbolton, Ye Ken," "Here's to Thy Health," "On Cessnock Banks," "Mary Morrison," "Raging Fortune," "My Father Was a Farmer," "When First I Came to Stuart Kyle," "Tho Cruel Fate Should Bid Us Part," "Young Peggy," "Her Flowing Locks," "The Rantin Dog," "Will Ye Go to the Indies, My Mary?" "If Ye Gae up to Yon Hill," "And I'll Kiss Thee Yet," "O Why the Deuce Should I Repine?" "Wha Is That at My Bower Door?" "O Leave Novels, Ye Mauchline Belles," "The Belles of Mauchline," "One Night as I Did Wander," "There Was a Lad Was Born in Kyle," "The Katrine Woods," "O Merry Hae I Been," "Here's His Health in Water," "Nae Gentle Dames," "A Mauchline Wedding." The first five in the list found places in the first Edinburgh edition. The last may be later than July, 1786. The *Centenary*, in its note on "Green Grow the Rashes" (I, 415) misprints 1786 for 1784 in the sentence, "entered by Burns in the *First Commonplace Book*, under date August, 1786."

that he would have written so many had he not enjoyed the process and appreciated the product. Nor was the Burns of 1786 a mere learner in the art which by 1793 he was to have mastered, and therefore somewhat diffident about publication. He knew that he improved whatever he touched of the great mass of old vernacular song, and he had already written some of his own most stirring lyrics. Those destined to become most widely known of all were not yet in existence, to be sure, but there were "Mary Morrison," the lyrics of "The Jolly Beggars," and a dozen others that would have graced the little volume. No, rather it seems probable that at this period of his poetic career Burns thought that he would be wasting money by printing Scottish songs. If his audience had requested them he was in a position to meet the request; that he did not offer more of his wares is indication of a slight demand for them. In this connection it is somewhat significant that the four songs which do appear in the Kilmarnock volume stand near the close of the book, as if thrown in to fill up space after all appropriate and available "poems" had been utilized. The first hundred and fifty pages contain the best of the collection, and in these pages there is no song. From pages 151 to 221 the average excellence is somewhat lower, but it is not till the fourteen pages which bring the book to a close that the lyrics appear, and then they are lumped with the epitaphs and epigrams. In this last section there is little which might not well have been omitted. Apparently Kilmarnock in 1786 was not in the state of mind which was to prevail all over Great Britain after Johnson had succeeded in interesting Burns in the *Scots Musical Museum*. It was the poet's cue to give his public what it considered poetry; accordingly he left "Mary Morrison" in the desk drawer, and sent "To Ruin" and "Man Was Made to Mourn" to the printer.

If one is justified in drawing any conclusions from the omissions from this first volume, then, it would seem that Burns was perhaps more consciously deferential to public opinion than he is sometimes thought to have been. He omitted the poems which would have given deepest offense to the respectability of his community, and he omitted all but four of the many songs he had written, not because he himself did not approve of them, but because they were not just then in favor with his audience.

II. THE LANGUAGE OF THE VOLUME

That Burns realized the difficulties of his language, at least for the English reader, is evident from the fact that he supplied a glossary as well as occasional footnotes. In the head note to the glossary occurs this statement: "The participle present, instead of *ing*, ends, in the Scotch dialect, in *an* or *in;* in *an*, particularly, when the verb is composed of the participle present, and any of the tenses of the auxiliary, *to be.*"[1] On this question of language the *Centenary* notes: "The peculiar feature of the 1786 edition is the *an, et,* and *'t* endings. . . . . Probably on Creech's advice he abolished the older endings in his edition of 1787, substituting *in'* or *ing* for *an* and *it* for *et.*"[2]

The person who reads the *Centenary* note and Burns's explanatory statement, but does not examine the volume itself, would almost inevitably expect to find the Scottish forms, particularly the *an* present participle, generally throughout the book. But such is not the case. The *an* occurs in all some 84 times, and of this total 64 appear in "The Holy Fair" (24), "The Twa Dogs" (14), "Address to the Deil" (11), "The Author's Earnest Cry and Prayer" (6), "Hallowe'en" (5), and the "Postscript" to the "Epistle to W.S." (4). The remaining 20 are distributed among 38 poems. And even in the two showing the most *an*-forms, there is neither uniformity of usage nor predominance of the older ending.

Of course no one would attach any great significance to such a fact. But in Burns's failure to make more consistent use of the Scottish form and in the nonchalance with which he allowed *ing* to crowd out *an*, even in the most thoroughly Scottish of his poems, there is a not uninteresting confirmation, as regards one detail, of President Neilson's generalization that "Burns did not habitually speak or write now Scots, now English. It would be nearer the truth to say that he always wrote more or less Scots, more or less English."[3]

On the larger question of Burns's success or lack of success in English, President Neilson's article is the latest and most authoritative pronouncement. His statement that "Burns wrote some of his

[1] *Facsimile*, p. 236.

[2] *Centenary*, I, 316.

[3] *Kittredge Memorial Volume*, p. 168. For an example of a poet who did write "now Scots, now English," one need look no further than Fergusson, whose linguistic habits were in this respect radically different from those of Burns.

best poetry in that southern speech which he is supposed to have been unable to master" does not admit of question. But of the poems cited by President Neilson in proof of his proposition only one, "A Bard's Epitaph," appears in the Kilmarnock edition, and only one other, "The Jolly Beggars," was probably written before the volume appeared. Furthermore, an analysis of the entire contents of this first publication shows that, if Burns were to be judged by it alone, the usual generalization that he was unsuccessful in English would be quite in accord with the facts.

The situation as regards the volume is this: omitting the epitaphs and epigrams as unimportant and listing the poems as "Scottish," "English and Scottish," and "English"—undoubtedly an unscientific classification, but one which may fairly be taken to represent the way the average intelligent reader of Burns characterizes his work—one gets the following result. Of the first, the Scottish, there are 16; of the second, the mixed class, there are 11; and of the third, the English, there are 7.[1] Of all these poems the only ones which have contributed in any significant measure to Burns's fame, and which are not entirely Scottish, are "The Cotter's Saturday Night" and "To a Mountain Daisy," both of which appear in the second or mixed group and both of which illustrate the popular notion that when Burns tried to write in English he wrote poorly. Of the purely English poems in the volume—"The Lament," "Man Was Made to Mourn," "Winter," "A Prayer in the Prospect of Death," "To Ruin," and "From Thee, Eliza, I Must Go"—there is not one which strengthened the book in the slightest. So far as this volume is concerned Burns did not write well in English.

[1] It is not always easy to say whether a certain poem is or is not distinctly Scottish. President Neilson writes, for instance, that "Scots Wha Hae" is "all English except the first two lines" (*Kitt. Mem. Vol.*, p. 166), yet some readers, perhaps most, would say that the line "Wha sae base as be a slave" has a distinct Scottish tang. Or again, as illustration of the same difficulty, take President Neilson's comment on "The Jolly Beggars," which consists, he says, "of eight hilarious songs set in a broad dialect 'recitativo.' More than half of the songs are English, almost, if not quite pure; and these contribute as much as the others to the poetic quality of the piece" (*ibid.*, p. 165). It is possible to disagree with such a statement, and to say that of the eight songs only the three beginning "I am a son of Mars," "I once was a maid," and "See the smoking bowl before us" are English, and that the others are either thoroughly Scottish, like "Let me ryke up to dight that tear," or else belong in the mixed class, like "A Highland lad my love was born." The difficulty is apparent in the first stanza of this last song. Are the lines

> The lalland laws he held in scorn,
> But still was faithful to his clan,
> My gallant, braw, John Highlandman

English or Scottish?

That Burns at this time realized the inferiority of his English work, or at least cared less for it than for the Scottish, there are some indications in the book itself. To begin with he advertised a volume of Scottish poems.[1] Till page 150 was reached he printed Scottish poems, there being to this point no purely English piece and only four which show any considerable intermixture of English verses. The average excellence of these first one hundred and fifty pages is astonishingly high. But one hundred and fifty pages seem to have used up most of his available "Scottish poems." Accordingly, to give his subscribers good measure, he threw in what came most easily to hand: a group of five English poems—they filled twenty pages—a lot of versified epistles, some poor songs, and a large batch of epigrams and epitaphs. Then, last of all, he changed the "Scottish poems" of the "Proposals for Publishing," to the "Poems, chiefly in the Scottish dialect," of the printed work.

If I am right in thinking the arrangement of the volume indicates that the poet went through some such mental process while making up his book, the conclusion that he esteemed his English work less highly than his Scottish seems almost inescapable. And certainly the generalization to which President Neilson objects appears to be quite in accord with the facts as established by this first volume.[2]

How Burns attained to the mastery of English that appears in many of the later songs, and whether or not his Edinburgh experience contributed in any way to his growth in linguistic flexibility, are questions to which a certain amount of interest may attach. It seems to me quite probable that one of the reasons for the clear improvement in Burns's English work is to be sought in the literary influences

[1] "Proposals for Publishing."

[2] It might be objected that possibly Burns by 1786 had developed his mastery of English, and that evidence on the point should be sought, not alone in the printed work, but in the unpublished as well. In the poems excluded from the Kilmarnock edition there is nothing that will change the statements made above. The satires and epistles excluded are either entirely Scottish or, like "Holy Willie's Prayer," predominantly Scottish with an intermixture of English stanzas. Of the many songs written by the summer of 1786 not one of the English would be included in the list of Burns's notable productions, unless we admit the lyrics of "The Jolly Beggars" as we now have them to represent the lyrics of the early draft that Richmond listened to. The remainder of Burns's English work in existence at the time consists of the fragments "Remorse" and "All Villain as I Am"—both entirely negligible, except for the fact that they show him experimenting in blank verse—and of pieces like the "Stanzas Written in Prospect of Death," "Paraphrase of the First Psalm," and "The Nineteenth Psalm Versified."

under which he worked. His early reading, so far as it was English, carried him chiefly into the field where the ideals of Dryden, Pope, Gay, and Shenstone were supreme. When he himself began to write, the use of English meant more or less conscious imitation of these masters of the southern speech. Later in life, as his own powers developed, and as his work for Johnson and Thomson took him more and more into the domain of the lyric, he acquired the art of expressing himself in English without following the old models too closely. And as his art became more independent of the pseudo-classicists, it became in all ways more worth while. This is at least a possible explanation for Burns's development. But the two points I have tried to establish in these notes—that Burns in 1786 paid careful attention to the prejudices of his audience and that by this time he had developed no real skill in English—are quite independent of the larger issue.

FRANKLYN BLISS SNYDER

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

THE SOURCES OF *ST. ERKENWALD* AND *THE TRENTAL OF GREGORY*

I. "ST. ERKENWALD"

Though the Middle English poem *St. Erkenwald* has attracted considerable attention, particularly in connection with the revival of alliterative verse in the fourteenth century, its relation to the widespread mediaeval story of St. Gregory and Trajan has not been pointed out.[1] Stripped of the descriptive details that give it vividness, the story of *St. Erkenwald* is as follows:

During the bishopric of St. Erkenwald repairs were being made on the fabric of St. Paul's at London. In the time of the Britons a temple dedicated to a heathen divinity had stood on this spot. While engaged on the repairs, workmen uncovered a splendid tomb inscribed with runish letters, which none could read. Many people gathered about the tomb, and the mayor caused it to be opened. Within lay a man "al w^{t} golde payntyde . . . . araide one a riche wise in rialle wedes" and wearing a crown. His clothes were in perfect condition, "as þai hade ȝepely in þat ȝorde bene ȝisturday shapene," and his face was as fresh and red as though he had "slippide opone slepe." The people wondered who the man could be and thought he had been a king. Word of the wonder was carried to Erkenwald, who was visiting an abbey in Essex. He returned to London and spent the night in prayer, beseeching God to reveal to him the mystery of the marvel and receiving answer that his request was granted. Next morning he celebrated mass and then went to the tomb. He addressed the body: "Sithene we wot not qwo þou art, witere vs þi-selwene, In worlde quat weghe þou was & quy þow þus ligges." The body moved a little, sighed, and answered that he was not a king but a man of law, a judge of this city. Erkenwald asked him why he wore a crown. The dead man answered that for forty years he had ruled the city as judge justly: "I remewit neuer fro þe riȝt by resone myne awene." For this reason the people "coronyd me þe kidde kynge of kene iustises." The bishop asked him how it was that his clothes had not rotted, and why his body had not decayed. The man answered that the rich king of reason that loves the laws belonging to truth [had preserved his

[1] Professor Gerould in his *Saints' Legends* (p. 238) remarks merely: "Possibly our poet may have found the story in the 'crafty cronecles' of which he speaks, or he may have taken his materials from a tradition of the Welsh marches." Of course Neilson (*Huchown*, p. 113) argues that details in Erkenwald are derived from the English *Trental of St. Gregory*. His evidence, parallel passages, is of no value.

clothing]. The bishop asked about his soul. The man groaned and lamented that he had been a pagan who knew not Christianity. When Christ harried hell he left the body's soul there. The man lamented that he had not been baptised, speaking so sorrowfully that everyone wept. The bishop with "lauande teres" prayed God that the man might have life until water could be brought to baptise him. He spoke the words of baptism, and as he did so his tears fell upon the tomb and on the man's face. The man sighed and blessed Christ, for the Bishop's tears had baptised him. After he had spoken his body decayed rapidly.[1]

This story is in its main outlines the same as that told in the Middle Ages about Trajan and St. Gregory. As this legend has been studied fully by Gaston Paris[2] and Arturo Graf[3] it will not be necessary to consider it here at length.

The earliest form of the story does not bear as close resemblance to the narrative about Erkenwald as do some of the later versions. It appears in the life of St. Gregory written by Paulus Diaconus in 787:

One day when St. Gregory was walking through the forum of Trajan he observed the evidences of the Emperor's pity (*insignia misericordiae*) and learned about a certain memorable act: Once when Trajan, surrounded by his soldiers, was starting on an expedition, an aged widow met him and prayed for vengeance on the slayers of her son. He tried to put her off, but when she insisted, rendered justice. St. Gregory wept when he heard the story and prayed to God in behalf of Trajan. Going to St. Peter's he continued to pray and in a dream learned that his request was granted. He was warned, however, not to pray again for an unbaptised dead person.[4]

The story is repeated in the life of Gregory by Johannes Diaconus, who begins it with a reference to English authorities as his source: "Legitur etiam penes easdem Anglorum Ecclesias," etc. John of Salisbury, Vincent of Beauvais, John Bromyard, and Dante tell the story much as Paulus Diaconus does. In none of these do we have a miraculously preserved body and the baptism at the tomb. It is obvious, however, that the story offers opportunities for development. Such development does occur in two ways: by elaboration

[1] Horstmann, *Altenglische Legenden*, Neue Folge, pp. 265–74.

[2] "La légende de Trajan" in *Bibliothèque de l'école des hautes études*, 1878.

[3] *Roma nella memoria e nelle immaginazioni del medio evo* (1889), II, 1 ff.

[4] Graf (*op. cit.*, p. 5) gives reasons for supposing this narrative to be an early interpolation into the life by Paulus Diaconus. The text of Paulus as of the other authorities cited is printed by Graf. See references to his sources in his footnotes.

of the first part, Trajan's justice to the widow, and of the second part, the Bishop's intercession. In some of the extensions of the first part, which appear as early as the twelfth century, the slayer of the widow's son was Trajan's son.[1]

The development of the second part, however, more especially concerns us. In his comment on Dante's passage, Jacopo della Lana writes: "'Elli si legge che al tempo di san Gregorio papa si cavò a Roma una fossa per fare fondamento d'uno lavorio, e cavando li maestri, trovonno sotto terra uno monumento, lo quale fu aperto, e dentro era in fra l'altre ossa quello della testa del defunto, ed avea la lingua così rigido, carnosa e fresca, comme fusse pure in quella ora seppellita." The workers spread the news until it reached St. Gregory; the latter went to the spot and conjured the head to tell what was its condition in life. The tongue replied that it had been Trajan's, and that he was in hell because he was not a Christian. On investigation Gregory learned of Trajan's justice to the widow, and the story proceeds as usual. Here we have practically the same story as that of the *St. Erkenwald:* excavations, discovery of the tomb, the body able to speak, the visit of the bishop and the dialogue between the latter and the dead body, the emphasis on the pagan's justice, and his salvation through the intercession of the bishop. The chief differences are in the description of the dead body and in the means of salvation.

A text which gives a version much like that of Jacopo della Lana but is especially interesting because of its suppression of proper names is from a German source:

> Circa annum domini ut puto .M.CC. in Vienna repertum fuit caput cujusdam defuncti, lingua adhuc integra cum labiis, et loquebatur recte. Episcopo autem interrogante qualis fuisset in vita, respondit: Ego eram paganus et judex in hoc loco, nec unquam lingua mea protulit iniquam sententiam, quare etiam mori non possum, donec aqua Baptismi renatus, ad coelum evolem, quare propter hoc hanc gratiam apud Deum merui. Baptizato igitur capite, statim lingua in favillam corruit et spiritus ad Dominum evolavit.[2]

Of the texts presented by Graf this version is the nearest in its details to the story of *St. Erkenwald.* In particular it is notable that

[1] See Graf, pp. 20 ff.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

the dead body is that of a judge, not of an emperor, and that it was preserved because of the general justice—he never uttered an unjust sentence—not because of the particular instance of the widow. Furthermore, he is actually baptized. The description of the dead body and the manner of baptism, however, are still different.

Paris[1] and Graf[2] agree that of the two parts of the story the first is the older and was suggested by a bas relief (not now extant) which showed a female figure, symbolizing a province, on her knees before Trajan and his soldiers. To this first part, the mediaeval feeling that a just man ought to be saved caused the addition of the second episode.[3]

That the story of Trajan was known in England is clear, not only from the previously cited authorities, but also from its appearance in such popular works as *Piers the Plowman*[4] and collections of stories for use as exempla.[5] None of these, however, presents a form like the German text above.

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 292.

[2] *Op. cit.*, pp. 35–36.

[3] A somewhat similar story is told in the miracles of the Virgin; cf. Graf, p. 30, note, and the *Catalogue of Romances in . . . . the British Museum*, III, 633 (No. 31). But the details are essentially different, including interposition of the Virgin, and a person who had been baptized but had not confessed.

In the Middle Ages the story of Trajan was associated with an Arch of Piety standing before the Pantheon. The statements made in mediaeval documents imply, but do not specifically say, that the scene of Trajan and the widow was represented in a bas-relief on the Arch. Capgrave reports that the arch "was mad as þei say for swech a cause" and then narrates the story of the emperor and the widow, suppressing the emperor's name. His probable source, the mediaeval guidebook of Rome known as *Mirabilia Romae*, does not even state that the arch was built in commemoration of the event. It mentions the arch and then says that the incident happened there. (See Capgrave's *Solace of Pilgrimes*, ed. C. A. Mills, Oxford, 1911, p. 19 and note, and F. M. Nichols' *The Marvels of Rome*, London, 1889, pp. 14, 15.) In an article in the *Nuova Antologia* for November 1, 1906 (pp. 3–39), Giacomo Boni discusses the legend of Trajan, giving many interesting pictures which show how the story was used in mediaeval painting and sculpture. He has found a bas-relief on the Arch of Constantine, which he thinks may have given rise to the story. It shows a woman sitting, her right hand raised in supplication to a Roman figure, who is surrounded by other men, some in military dress, and two accompanied by horses. Boni suggests that the Middle Ages may have supposed this figure to be Trajan because of his reputation for justice.

[4] B text XI, 131–53, C text XIII, 74–91; B text XII, 210–11, C text XV, 150; B text XII, 281, C text XV, 205.

[5] *Catalogue of Romances*, III, 325 (English verse, printed by Horstmann, *Archiv. für d. St. d. n. Spr.*, LVII, 306), 383, 394, 400, 410, 411, 506, 538, 630, 638, 717. It is also told by Wyntoun in his *Chronicle*, III, 289 ff., and appears frequently in manuscripts of the *Northern Homily Collection*. (See C. F. Brown, *Register of Middle English Religious Verse*, I, 44, 82, 164, 191, 198, 335, 397, 425, 438, 483, 492.)

On the other hand the story is associated with St. Erkenwald only in the poem under consideration and in one Latin source.[1] It is certain that originally the story was attached to Trajan and Gregory, because not only does it occur very early and in many versions using those names, but, as we have seen, its origin and development can be studied from the misunderstanding of a bas-relief to a double story involving a saint's miracle. At a later time the legend was attached to Erkenwald for the purpose of glorifying that saint. It does not perform this function very successfully, for the central figure of the story is rather the nameless judge than the famous bishop;[2] and the absence of it in the standard accounts of Erkenwald's life seems to indicate that it gained no great currency. Perhaps the compiler of the Latin *Miracula* was actually the first person to attach it to Erkenwald, and perhaps his narrative is the direct source of the English poem. In any case, unless there was an expanded intermediary between the Latin legend and the English poem, the picturesque development of the legend is due entirely to the English poet.[3]

II. "The Trental of Gregory"

In his *Saints' Legends* Professor Gerould suggests that the Trajan story is the source of the *Trental of Gregory:* "Undoubtedly it [the *Trental*] was suggested by the incident in the life of Gregory the Great . . . . how he was moved by pity to pray for the soul of the Emperor Trajan. But in this case imaginative tradition played with a beautiful incident unfortunately and sadly distorted it."[4] This connection of the Trajan story with that of the *Trental* is, I am convinced, erroneous. That they have had entirely independent histories I shall try to show in the following pages.

[1] See Stubbs's article in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, and the authorities cited there.

The Latin source is in the *Miracula Sancti Erkenwaldi* [MS. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge], Horstmann, *Altenglische Legenden*, p. 528. Neilson remarks that the *Miracula* "does not at all account for the detailed and romantically specific story" (*Huchown*, p. 105, note).

[2] This is realized by the people who tell the story about Trajan and Gregory; they emphasize the former rather than the latter.

[3] I owe much in the foregoing study to my friend, Dr. H. E. Rollins. His paper on *St. Erkenwald* reminded me of the story at a time when I happened to have been reading about Trajan in Dante. He also called my attention to the *Piers the Plowman* passages.

[4] P. 230.

The story of the *Trental* is as follows:

The mother of a certain pope had a great reputation for sanctity; secretly, however, she lived in adultery and moreover had slain her two children. After her death she appeared in torment to her son. She told him that she would be saved if a trental of masses (for which she gave exact directions) were said for her. The pope had the masses said, and at the end of the year she appeared to him in so radiant a form that he supposed her to be the Virgin. The poem ends with some fifty lines discussing the proper methods of performing the trental.[1]

A comparison of the story of the *Trental* with that of Trajan shows essential differences. In the former the ghost of a mother appears to her son; she was of course a Christian, but is in purgatory suffering for unexpiated sins. In the latter the undecayed body of a man is found; he was a heathen but always just, and he needs merely baptism to save him. The aim of the first story is didactic, to show the virtue of a trental of masses for the dead; that of the other is merely to tell how by a miracle the soul of a dead heathen was saved. Surely argument is not needed to demonstrate the entire lack of relation between the two. As Paris and Graf have shown, the story of Trajan can be traced from the misunderstanding of a piece of ancient sculpture to its latest and most complex form. On the other hand, the story of the *Trental* is merely a special subtype of a large class of stories which appear in exempla books and other collections. The large class is that which tells of the appearance of ghosts to friends or relatives. These stories have a didactic purpose quite unlike any that can be attached to the Trajan legend; they warn the reader of the fearful results of sin or teach him a method of expiating sin.

One can discern many subtypes of this class and make a more or less likely guess as to their chronological development.[2] The special

[1] A. Kaufmann, *Trentalle Sancti Gregorii* (1889). This is Kaufmann's Version A. Version B differs from A chiefly in that the powers of evil try to prevent the pope's completing the trental by sending false messengers who tell him that his palace is on fire, that his men are all dead, etc. For the bibliography of the *Trental* see Wells's *Manual*, p. 789. Perhaps Professor Gerould made this connection because in some of the manuscripts the pope is said to be Gregory. Kaufmann (pp. 4, 5) has shown, however, that this name was not in the original of these manuscripts, and that it was added because of Gregory's association with the trental. His view is borne out by the fact that the name does not appear in the French text mentioned below, p. 493.

[2] In the study of these stories that follows I have made no attempt at completeness. The materials available for such a purpose are far too extensive to be compressed into a short article. My classification is very probably incorrect in details. But it serves, I think, to show the freedom of the *Trental* story from connection with the legend of Trajan.

details vary greatly; I shall select merely certain types which, I think, bear on the *Trental*. In the simplest type the soul is damned irrevocably and appears merely to warn the friend or relative to avoid sin. For example: A dead nun appears in torment to her aunt, an abbess, and says that she is damned for harboring impure thoughts.[1] In another story, a dead nun appears carrying a burning child and says that she is damned for unconfessed inchastity and infanticide.[2] In a third, a lady, vain of her hair, appears after death to one of her husband's grooms; she is tormented by devils, who put toads and scorpions on her head.[3] A fifth tells how a smith in England is aroused at night to shoe a mare ridden by a fiend in human shape; the mare tells him that she is his mother, punished for having been a priest's concubine.[4] A very widespread story is that of the priest's dead mother, who appears with serpents at her breast and reveals that she is damned for adultery and the murder of her two infants.[5]

An obvious extension of this type is the kind of story in which the spirit is saved by action of the person to whom it appears. Frequently the spirit gives directions to the person. For example, an abbot sees his sister tormented by four dragons because she had neglected her mother. He saves her by saying masses.[6] In another, a saintly virgin at her death feels pride. She appears to the pope five days later in torment. He is able to release her by saying seven masses.[7] In a third, a dead girl appears to a clerk who had loved her. She says she is in purgatory for thinking of him, and asks him to get the prayers of a certain priest for her. If he gets them he will find a lock of her black hair turned white.[8] Somewhat similar is the

[1] *Catalogue of Romances*, III, 471.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 699, No. 5. Herbert refers to the same story in Caesarius of Hesterbach, XII, 21.

[3] *Catalogue of Romances*, III, 677, 280. See also p. 94 for the story of a French countess damned for her love of finery. Herbert refers to Etienne de Bourbon, *Anec.*, p. 26, and Herolt, *Sermones de Tempore*, No. 141.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 380.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 9, 83, 95, 96, 258, 375, 397, 475, 483, 502, 565, 644, 679 (twice), 682 (twice). Cf. the English *Gesta Romanorum*, ed. Herrtage, E.E.T.S., pp. 383–84. See the references in his note. These versions vary somewhat in details.

[6] *Catalogue of Romances*, III, 183; *Romania*, XIII, 27–59. A similar story appears in *Catalogue of Romances*, III, 260.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 586.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 394.

story of a sinner who neglects to perform penance before his death. A friend promises to perform it. After one year the sinner appears to his friend two-thirds black, one-third white; the second year he is whiter, the third all white.[1] In another story, a man in ecstasy sees his mother seated on burning coals; he weeps incessantly for a fortnight, and then learns that his tears have extinguished the fire.[2] The point of the following story is much like that of the *Trental* except that it emphasizes the value of the Beatus for souls in purgatory. A cleric recites the Beatus and the psalms seven times a day for a year to aid the soul of his dead mistress. Her spirit appears to him and says that she is almost rescued and that the Beatus has helped her most. Later he sees her body taken out of the bog in which she was buried and conveyed to the graveyard. "So that the Beatus is better than any prayer for saving a soul from devils."[3]

In some stories the means used to free the tortured soul is the celebration of a trental of masses. The trental of masses has always since his time been associated with Pope Gregory I, who is supposed to have originated the plan. The clearest indication of the origin of the trental appears in a narrative in his *Dialogues* (IV, 55) of an incident which happened when he was abbot. After the death of a certain monk of his convent named Justus, who had committed the sin of keeping personal possession of certain worldly goods, Gregory took pity on him and ordered masses to be said daily for him for thirty days. After the thirtieth mass the spirit of Justus appeared to his brother and revealed the fact that the masses had saved him. From this episode, evidently, the trental became widely celebrated as a help to departed persons, and it is still performed for the purpose.[4]

It was natural therefore that this well-known aid to spirits in purgatory should be used, as the means of deliverance, in stories of the sort we have been considering. It does so appear in the frequently repeated story of the bishop and the soul in the block of ice. A block of ice had been brought to a certain bishop (called by various

[1] Etienne de Bourbon, p. 35. See *Catalogue of Romances*, III, 667, 675.

[2] *Catalogue of Romances*, III, 563.

[3] *Lives of the Saints from the Book of Lismore* (ed. W. Stokes), Preface, p. x.

[4] See Buchberger's *Kirchliches Handlexikon* under *Gregorian Messen*, and the works referred to there; also Kaufmann's ed. of the *Trental*, p. 50.

names: Theodulus, Theodosius, Theobaldus, etc.) to relieve him of a burning in his leg. A voice speaking from the ice said that a soul was imprisoned in it but could be released if the bishop would say thirty masses on thirty successive days. The bishop started to do so, but was impeded by the devil, who sent false messages to him.[1] At length after making several starts the bishop completed the masses, and the soul was freed.[2] Likewise the common story of the priest's mother who was damned for adultery and infanticide[3] had a similar ending attached to it. This extension, of course, makes the story as we have it in the *Trental*. It exists in French prose and has been pointed out as the source of the English poem.[4] As there is no essential difference between this French story and that of the *Trental*, it is unnecessary to summarize the former here.[5]

From the preceding discussion it must be clear, not only that the story of Trajan and that of the *Trental* are radically different, but also that they have had entirely different histories. There is no reason whatever for considering the story of Trajan in connection with the *Trental*.

James Root Hulbert

University of Chicago

[1] As in Version B of the *Trental*. See above, p. 490, n. 1.

[2] Latin text in Klapper, *Exempla aus Hss. des M. A.*, No. 23. See Crane, *Mod. Phil.*, X, 309, and *Catalogue of Romances*, III, 330, for references to other occurrences of the story; *Romania* XIV, 395; Horstmann, *Altenglische Legenden*, Neue Folge, pp. 147–48 (also the Temple edition of the *Golden Legend*, VI, 113, for English translation).

[3] See above, p. 491.

[4] Printed by P. Meyer, *Romania*, XV, 282. Varnhagen suggested, in *Anglia*, XIII, 105, that it was the source of the *Trental*.

[5] Elaborated forms which are presumably later in development than the French prose and the English verse form appear. For example, there is one of a young man who saved his mother by means of thirty masses (*Catalogue of Romances*, III, 702). *The Child of Bristowe* is similar; here, however, *XXX^te trental of masses* (l. 218) are not sufficient to save the wicked father; the son has to pay back all his father's ill-gotten gains (Horstmann, *Altenglische Legenden* [1881], p. 317). Another story which indicates reaction against the idea that so simple a thing as masses will save a sinful spirit appears in *Catalogue of Romances*, III, 682, No. 11: "Mother pays for masses for her dead daughter, until she has nothing left but a ring, which she gives a priest for one more mass, insisting that it is to be for her daughter's exclusive benefit; the daughter appears, and tells her mother that her companions in purgatory hoot at her." See also *ibid.*, No. 12: "Priest told by his dead mother that his masses for her have brought relief to the souls in purgatory, but not to her."

A NOTE ON RICHARDSON'S RELATION TO FRENCH FICTION

In an article published in the *Modern Language Review* for October, 1913,[1] the late G. C. Macaulay raised anew the problem of Richardson's indebtedness to Marivaux and other French novelists of the early eighteenth century, and presented evidence which in his opinion practically established the reality of the influence.

The evidence consisted of a preface, hitherto overlooked, contributed at Richardson's request to the fourth volume of the first edition of *Clarissa Harlowe* (1748) by one whom he afterward described as "a very learned and eminent Hand."[2] The main object of this preface was to recommend *Clarissa* to the public as an example of true realism in fiction. By way of introduction, however, the writer of the preface sketched in general terms the history of the emergence of realistic prose fiction from mediaeval romance, and in particular praised some of his French contemporaries (though without naming them) for their discovery of "the true Secret, by which alone a deviation from strict fact, in the commerce of Man, could be really entertaining to an improved mind, or useful to promote that Improvement," namely, by a "faithful and chaste copy of real *Life and Manners*." He then passed to his eulogy of Richardson's work with the following transitional statement: "It was on this sensible Plan, that the Author of the following Sheets attempted to please, in an Essay, which had the good fortune to meet with success [*Pamela*]: That encouragement engaged him in the present Design."[3] Upon

[1] VIII. 464–67.

[2] For convenience of reference I reproduce Richardson's account of the writing of this preface: "The work having been originally published at three different times; and a greater distance than was intended having passed between the first publication and the second; a Preface was thought proper to be affixed to the third and fourth Volumes; being the second publication. A very learned and eminent Hand was so kind as to favour the Editor, at his request, with one. But the occasion of inserting it being *temporary*, and the Editor having been left at liberty to do with it as he pleased, it was omitted in the Second Edition, when the whole work came to be printed together" (Preface to the third edition of *Clarissa Harlowe*, quoted by Macaulay, pp. 466–67).

[3] Quoted by Macaulay, p. 466.

this passage Macaulay based a conclusion directly contradictory of what has long been the accepted opinion on the subject:[1]

> We have then here a definite statement made on Richardson's own authority that in writing *Pamela* he had been following the lead of those modern French writers who had at length hit upon the true secret. . . . . It is clear that Richardson acknowledges obligation to the way of writing in which some of the late French writers had greatly excelled, and that he ascribes not to himself but to the French the discovery of the true secret of fiction.[2]

Now, without questioning Macaulay's interpretation of the somewhat vague wording of the passage quoted, one may at least object that a great deal depends upon the identity of the "very learned and eminent Hand" who wrote it. Macaulay himself raised the question of authorship, but did not apparently realize its bearing upon his argument. Had he done so, it is extremely doubtful if he could have written of the preface that "in any case Richardson must be held responsible for the observations that it contains."[3] As it was, beyond suggesting, and immediately rejecting, Johnson, he made no attempt to deal with the problem.

My own conclusion is that the preface was the work of William Warburton, and that consequently it is of little or no value as a reflection of Richardson's thought.

The evidence for Warburton's authorship is so easily accessible as to cause one to wonder that Macaulay should have overlooked it. The fact is twice recorded in Nichols' *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century* (1812), once in connection with Richardson and once in connection with Warburton. The first and longer of the two passages is as follows: "Highly as his reputation as an Author was raised by *Pamela*, he acquired, and very justly, still higher fame, in 1747, by his *Clarissa*, which was honoured with a Preface from the pen of the very learned Mr. Warburton."[4] The other reference is a

[1] See Joseph Texte, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau et les origines du cosmopolitanisme littéraire* (1895), pp. 190–92; Clara Thomson, *Samuel Richardson* (1900), pp. 147–53; Austin Dobson, *Samuel Richardson* (1902), pp. 48–50; L. Cazamian, *Cambridge History of English Literature*, X (1913), 3–4.

[2] P. 467. Macaulay's conclusion is cited with approval in an article by Carola Schroers, "Ist Richardsons *Pamela* von Marivauxs *Vie de Marianne* beeinflusst?" in *Englische Studien*, Band XLIX (1916), 220–54. See especially pp. 220–21, 237.

[3] P. 467.

[4] *Literary Anecdotes*, IV, 582–83.

bare mention of "a Preface to Mr. Richardson's *Clarissa*" in a list of Warburton's writings for 1747.[1] Though unfortunately neither of these statements bears any indication of Nichols' source of information, and though we cannot, therefore, regard them as entirely conclusive, there exist other facts which make it reasonably sure that he was telling the truth. In the first place, we know from Warburton's correspondence that as early as December, 1742, he had become acquainted with Richardson, had formed a distinctly favorable opinion of his first novel, *Pamela*, and stood ready to serve him in any way within his power.[2] Then, too, Richardson's characterization of the writer of the preface to *Clarissa* as a "very learned and eminent Hand" fitted exactly, even to its language, the reputation which Warburton enjoyed in the middle years of the century.[3] But the most complete confirmation of Nichols' statements is the similarity which exists between the preface to *Clarissa* and an essay on the origin of "Books of Chivalry" which Warburton contributed in 1742 to the first edition of Charles Jarvis' *Don Quixote*.[4] The two prefaces display the same interest in the history of prose fiction (not a common interest among Englishmen in the forties), the same somewhat scornful attitude toward the mediaeval romances, and the same emphasis on their popularity in Spain.[5] In short, when we consider

[1] *Ibid.*, V, 599. Sir Leslie Stephen repeats the ascription in his article on Richardson in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

[2] Warburton to Richardson, December 28, 1742 (Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*, V, 582, note; *The Correspondence of Samuel Richardson* [ed. Barbauld, 1804], I, 133–34): "This very day, on receiving my things from London, I had the pleasure to find in the box an obliging letter from you, of the 17th past, with a very kind and valuable present of a fine edition of your excellent work, which no one can set a higher rate upon. I find they have both lain all this time at Mr. Bowyer's. I have so true an esteem for you, that you may depend on any thing in my power, that you think may be of any service to you." The letter ends with some suggestions regarding Pamela's conduct in high life, a topic which Warburton promises to discuss more fully when he sees Richardson in town.

[3] See Jarvis' translation of *Don Quixote* (1742), in which Warburton is referred to as "a learned writer, well known in the Literary World" (ed. 1756, I, sig. C, note); the 1754 edition of Warton's *Observations on the Faerie Queene of Spenser*, in which he is called "an admirable judge" of questions relating to the mediaeval romances (p. 43); and the 1762 edition of the same work, which alludes to him as "one who has shewn his masterly skill and penetration in every part of literature" (I, 63). Hurd, in a note added to the 1788 edition of his *Letters on Chivalry and Romance*, spoke of his "exactness of learning, and penetration" (note to Letter II).

[4] He later reprinted it, with slight changes, among the notes to *Love's Labour's Lost* in his edition of Shakespeare (1747).

[5] The preface to *Clarissa* spoke of the romances as follows: "Strict matters of fact, how delicately soever dressed up, soon grew too simple and insipid to a taste stimulated by the Luxury of Art: They wanted something of more poignancy to quicken and enforce a jaded appetite. Hence the original of the first barbarous *Romances*, abounding with

Nichols' assertion in the light of the attendant circumstances—Warburton's disposition to serve Richardson, his hearty sympathy with the type of novel represented by *Pamela*, and his personal interest in the history of fictitious composition—any reason we might have to suspect its accuracy disappears.

But once this is granted, what becomes of Macaulay's statement that "Richardson must be held responsible for the observations" contained in the preface? To begin with, it is clear from what has already been said that Warburton was under no necessity of going to Richardson for ideas about the latter's work or about the development of fiction in general; he had already, as early as 1742, formed conclusions of his own on both of these subjects. Nor, in the second place, were his personal relations to Richardson such as to make it likely that when the novelist asked him for a temporary preface to his new work, he would take any pains to constitute himself Richardson's mouthpiece. There is no evidence that the two men were ever intimate friends, or that, indeed, Warburton's acquaintance with Richardson ever went beyond the somewhat formal terms indicated by the "Good Sir" with which he began and ended one of his few letters to the novelist.[1] He was no doubt sincerely desirous to serve him, and he wrote the preface for *Clarissa* without any eye whatever to the enhancement of his own reputation; but no reason exists for assuming that in composing it he made any effort to ascertain and express Richardson's views. It was not his habit to do that in any

this false provocative of uncommon, extraordinary, and miraculous Adventures. But satiety, in things unnatural, soon brings on disgust. And the Reader, at length, began to see, that too eager a pursuit after *Adventures* had drawn him from what first engaged his attention, MAN, *and his Ways*, into the Fairy Walks of Monsters and Chimeras. And now those who had run farthest after these delusions, were the first that recovered themselves. For the next Species of Fiction, which took its name from its *novelty*, was of Spanish invention" (quoted by Macaulay, p. 465). In the earlier preface Warburton discussed in rapid succession the fondness of the Spaniards for stories of chivalry, the influence exerted on the subject-matter of the romances by the wars against the Saracens in Spain and the Crusades, the importance of Turpin's *Chronicle* and Geoffrey of Monmouth as sources of romantic ideas, the indebtedness of the romances to Eastern tales for their "monstrous embellishments of enchantments," and the reasons for the presence in the romances of "much religious superstition mixed with their other extravagances." The following sentence may be compared with the remarks quoted above from the preface to *Clarissa:* "The *Spaniards* were of all others the fondest of these fables, as suiting best their extravagant turn to galantry and bravery; which in time grew so excessive, as to need all the efficacy of this incomparable Satire to bring them back to their sober senses" (Jarvis' *Don Quixote* [ed. 1756], I, sig. C).

[1] Nichols, *op. cit.*, V, 582, 583. Richardson's letter, to which this was an answer, was markedly deferential in tone. See the extract in Dobson, *op. cit.*, p. 58. These letters, it is true, were both written in 1742; but the intervening years seem to have produced no material change in the relations of the two men.

case, even when the views were those of Pope himself. Finally, if the apparent connection made by the preface between *Pamela* and *Clarissa* and earlier French fiction—the crucial assertion of the document so far as Macaulay's argument is concerned—were really "authorized" by Richardson, it is very strange that he should not have retained the preface in later editions. As a matter of fact, not only did he omit Warburton's preface after the first edition, but in the definitive preface which he substituted for it in the third and subsequent editions he made no allusion whatever to the point.[1]

It should be clear by this time, I think, that Macaulay's assumption that the anonymous preface to *Clarissa* contains "a definite statement made on Richardson's own authority" concerning his indebtedness to the French novelists is open to very serious question. The truth is that the evidential value of the document is hardly greater than that of various other contemporary notices which saw in the author of *Pamela* and *Clarissa* a disciple of Marivaux.[2] The general problem of Richardson's relation to French fiction, in short, remains as it was before Macaulay's article was written—a doubtful hypothesis based upon similarities of substance and technique and unsupported by external facts.[3]

RONALD S. CRANE

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

[1] Macaulay, pp. 465–66. It is perhaps significant that the only mention of Marivaux that has been discovered in Richardson's writings is a rather slurring reference to the improbability of his romances, quoted, with apparent approval, from an anonymous French critic, in the "Postscript" to *Clarissa Harlow* (*Works* [ed. Leslie Stephen, 1883], VIII, 537).

[2] See Macaulay, p. 464, and Texte, *op. cit.*, p. 190.

[3] The fullest statement of the argument from internal resemblance is contained in the article by Carola Schroers cited above. Miss Schroers's parallels, many of which may be explained either as simple coincidences or as widely current narrative *clichés*, do not carry entire conviction. Since the present article was announced for publication, Miss Helen Sard Hughes, to whom the substance of my paper was communicated shortly after its completion, has advanced views identical with those of my last two paragraphs in an essay on the "Translations of the *Vie de Marianne* and Their Relation to Contemporary English Fiction" (*Modern Philology*, XV [1917], 509). She does not discuss the question of authorship.

[I can testify that the views to which Mr. Crane refers in the foregoing note as common to himself and Miss Hughes were developed independently by each of them. Several weeks before Miss Hughes knew of Mr. Crane's results her article was in my hands substantially as published in *Modern Philology*, XV, 491–512. On the other hand, Mr. Crane knew nothing of Miss Hughes's conclusions when he submitted his article (February or March, 1917). Their independent agreement in rejecting Macaulay's view as to Richardson's relation to the preface by the "learned and eminent hand"—approaching the question as they did from different angles and with different points of view—serves to confirm their conclusion. Mr. Crane's convincing argument that Warburton's was the "learned and eminent hand" and his inferences from that fact present an important phase of the question overlooked by Miss Hughes as well as all previous writers on the subject.—JOHN M. MANLY.]

A NOTE ON FRENCH-ENGLISH WORD PAIRS IN MIDDLE ENGLISH

"If too many foreign words are poured in, it looks as if they were designed, not to assist the natives, but to conquer them."—JOHN DRYDEN.

It is a commonly held opinion[1] that early Middle English writers used word pairs made up of a French and a native English word in order to make themselves clear to both their learned and their "lewed" readers. This opinion Jespersen[2] expresses in these words: "A greater assistance [in teaching the English population new words] may perhaps have been derived from a habit which may have been common in conversational speech, and which was at any rate not uncommon in writing, that of using a French word side by side with its native synonym, *the latter serving more or less openly as an interpretation of the former for the benefit of those who were not yet familiar with the more refined expression.*"

Objection to this interlinear theory is strongly expressed by Greenough and Kittredge[3] upon the sensible grounds that every sort of synonym combination is so common in Middle English that the practice of using French-English word pairs must be regarded as a mere stylistic habit and that the frequency of hybrid double expressions is largely due to the accident of the "composite character of our vocabulary." Stylistic habit is, indeed, accepted by Jespersen to account for the large number of instances of French-English word pairs in Chaucer and later in Caxton. Jespersen believes, furthermore, that these writers used double expressions to "heighten or strengthen the effect of the style." It must be denied, however, that Chaucer's "*endyte* and *make* a thing" (*Canterbury Tales*, A 95) and Caxton's "I toke a *glasse* or a *mirrour*" (p. 83), for example, are either higher or stronger than the use of the single verb or noun would have been. Shall we deny the trick to Layamon and to the author of the *Ancren Riwle* and grant it to Chaucer and to Caxton upon the assumption that French was better known to the readers of these

[1] Among others: Behrens, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der französischen Sprache in England," *Französische Studien*, V, 2, pp. 8–9; Jespersen, *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, pp. 96–97; Bladin, *Studies on Denominative Verbs in English* (Upsala diss., 1911), p. 22.

[2] Jespersen, *loc. cit.*; the italics are mine.

[3] *Words and Their Ways in English Speech*, p. 115.

later writers than it was to those of the earlier writers? If we suppose a smaller knowledge of French on the part of the reader of the *Ancren Riwle* than on the part of the reader of Caxton, we should not look for so many interlinear pairs in Caxton. But Caxton and later writers use them in remarkable measure. It is not quite fair to explain away Caxton's use by "mannerism" and at the same time to plead the special case of author's care for the ignorant reader to account for earlier instances of the same thing.

An added objection to Jespersen's view is the probability that early as well as late Middle English writers were touched with the author's vanity of desiring to display a knowledge of two languages. If the knowledge of French among the "lewed" was so small that it was necessary to gloss new words of French origin for them, acquaintance with such words surely would be looked at with admiration by the ignorant readers, and it was worth an author's while to exhibit his familiarity with new and exotic expressions.[1] If the writing was addressed to the learned, surely the learned could be expected to know the homely word, and the "more refined" expression was unnecessary. Layamon,[2] in the examples taken from the *Brut* by Behrens, tells us that he knows the equivalents of the English expressions in another language. In the example from the *Chronicle* (1137), cited in Behrens' collection, the writer merely observes that the French called *gœildes tenserie.*

The examples of French-English word pairs assembled in the Behrens-Jespersen collection are probable instances in early Middle English of a stylistic affectation which Shakespeare mocked in Holofernes: "The deer was, as you know, *sanguis*, in blood; ripe as the pomewater, who now hangeth like a jewel in the ear of *caelo*, the sky, the welkin, the heaven; and anon falleth like a crab on the face of *terra*, the soil, the land, the earth."[3]

JAMES FINCH ROYSTER
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

[1] The practice has not, of course, died. In thirty consecutive pages of the writing of a recent American author whose style is notorious for its uselessly foreign vocabulary I count just thirty foreign words and expressions, some of which are glossed; for example: "charlantry and *blague*"; "*prosateur*, prose artist."

[2] twelfe iferan
þe Freinsce heo cleopeden dusze pers (I, 1, 69).

to lokie in þan lufte
þe craft his ihote astronomie
in oþer kunnes speche (II, 2, 598).

[3] *Love's Labour's Lost*, IV, 2, 3 ff. See E. W. Fay, *American Journal of Philology*, XXXII, 408.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Shakespearean Playhouses. A History of English Theatres from the Beginnings to the Restoration. By Joseph Quincy Adams. Boston, New York, and Chicago: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1917. Pp. xiv+473.

Our knowledge of the Shakespearean playhouses and of the companies associated with them has been so vastly increased in recent years that all general studies of the subject more than a decade old are entirely inadequate. Moreover, so great has been the mass of the scattering articles and books on the subject that it has been impossible for any but the specialist to keep in touch with the field, and he has found difficulty in digesting the burdensome details. Professor Adams' *Shakespearean Playhouses* supplies just the book that was needed—a systematic survey of the whole field. The work is excellent in all its various phases. Good judgment has been shown in the correlation of scattered details and the necessary correction of false theories in the light of all the evidence. Indeed the clearness of the whole presentation—toward which a series of pictures, maps, and plans contributes decidedly—could have been achieved only by a complete master of the material. For instance, in the simple and direct presentation of evidence derived from voluminous and complicated documents, the studies of "The Theatre" (chap. iii) and of "The First Blackfriars" (chap. v) amount to fresh investigations. Many new facts also have been contributed by Professor Adams. Most notable is his reconstruction of the history of "The Cockpit-in-Court, or Theatre Royal at Whitehall" (chap. xx), a theater that has hitherto been confused with the Cockpit in Drury Lane or other buildings that bore the name of Cockpit (p. 408, n. 2).

Naturally a few minor gaps in the work could be pointed out. In connection with the history of the Bear Garden some account should have been given of Ralph, Thomas, and Edward Bowes, in succession Masters of "her Majesties Game at Paris Garden" from the early seventies until 1586 at least, and of the many occasions on which they brought the "game" before Queen Elizabeth (*Acts of the Privy Council*, 1571–5, pp. 185, 257, 391; 1575–7, pp. 9, 121, 154, 335, 360; 1577–8, p. 148; 1578–80, pp. 70, 392; 1580–1, p. 321; 1581–2, pp. 115, 311; 1586–7, p. 150). Some further notice of the forerunners of the Shakespearean theater outside of the inns would be of interest. Before 1526 Rastell erected in Finsbury Field some sort of fairly permanent stage, and conducted a theatrical enterprise for several years (cf. *Modern Philology*, XIII, 557, and Pollard, *Fifteenth Century Prose and Verse*

[New English Garner], pp. 307–21), thus anticipating by half a century Burbage's venture in the same region. There are also many instances recorded of buildings used as theaters before the time of the regular theaters, besides the "theatrum" of 1348 (misprinted 1548) at Exeter and the "game-house" of 1538 at Yarmouth noted by Adams (p. 44, n. 5). Thus on the suppression of the convent of the Black Friars at Norwich about 1540 the citizens petitioned, "To make of the churche a fayre and large halle . . . . for their common assemblages as often as shall be expedient, as they have always used it, tyme out of mynde"; in 1547 repairs were made after a riot at an interlude, and we hear of performances of plays in the building much later (*Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, XIV, 118–20). Such houses at London are indicated by an entry in 1566–7 among receipts in the churchwardens' accounts of St. Botolph without Aldersgate: "And wyth 22/2 for money by them receyved for the hyer of Tryntie Halle for playes, the warmanthe inquest [wardmote], and other assemblyes within the time of this accompt" (Fothergill, 10 *Notes and Queries*, VI, 287). The constant reference to buildings in connection with playing-places at inns (Adams, pp. 6–17) suggests that before the era of the regular theaters buildings for general assembly may have been erected in connection with inns, though in many cases the reference is probably to nothing more than a stage built in the innyard or large hall.

The nature of the field is such that no treatise can be considered final while the possibility remains of discovering new evidence, but it will be long, I believe, before Professor Adams' scholarly, orderly, and well-proportioned treatment is superseded.

C. R. BASKERVILL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVI *February 1919* NUMBER 10

STUDIES IN THE MIND OF ROMANTICISM

I. ROMANTIC MOTIVES OF CONDUCT IN CONCRETE DEVELOPMENT—*Continued*

On September 11, 1800, he arrives in Würzburg. He describes the town and the Catholic customs and ceremonies with many expressions of impatience. He prefers "the discourse of a priest or a poem by Gellert." Nothing could give a clearer picture of the retarded state of his literary education than his admiration for a poem by Gellert, a generation after Goethe's departure from Leipzig, and after his *Heidenröslein*, *Mailied*, and *Der König in Thule*. Yet in this very letter Kleist again makes *Gefühl* the standard of his judgments: "Altogether, it seems to me that all ceremonies suffocate sentiment. They occupy our reasoning powers [*Verstand*], but the heart remains dead."

The letter dated September 13, 1800, records a great acceleration in his progress. He is more enthusiastic and hopeful than ever before and again mysterious: "Girl, how happy you will be! And I! How you will weep on my neck, hot, devoted [*innige*] tears of joy! How you will thank me with all your soul! But quiet! Nothing is yet *quite* decided; but the die is cast, and if I see truly—the cast is a winning one" (*so stehen die Augen gut*).

There is nothing to indicate that this mysterious reference is to any definite practical aim or mission. As the following letters show,

he is pursuing the training of his inner powers with increasing intensity and aspiration. It is inevitable that a mind of his eagerness and creative imagination should frequently see, opening before him, sudden and immense inner prospects, that he should come under sudden spells of vague and somewhat mysterious, but none the less potent and genuine, inspirations. And with his intense disposition, both dramatic and nervously excitable, it would be natural that any sudden vision of great possibilities in store for him should seek utterance in demonstrative language. His mysterious allusions to great prospects need not even be interpreted as intentional mystifications. It is of the nature of such inspirations, such sudden visions, *Gesichtsblicke*—to anticipate a term used by Kleist in his chief characterization of his inseparable companion, Brockes—that great potency and even definiteness of direction is quite compatible with vague and even mysterious remoteness of concrete object.

On September 15 he writes with greater thoroughness of the aims he has set himself in his self-training. He is evidently devoting himself to the study of philosophy. He distinguishes three principal tendencies in philosophy in accordance with their definitions of the "purpose of our entire eternal existence." "Whether," he says, in his amazingly patronizing manner, "the enjoyment of happiness" (*Genuss der Glückseligkeit*), as Epicurus thought, or "the attainment(!) of perfection," as Leibnitz thought, or "the fulfillment of dry duty," as Kant assures us, is the final end of man, that is a barren inquiry even for men and often ruinous.

This curt rejection of any teleological standards of judgments is of interest in showing the instinctive rebellion of his subjective nature against any external standards threatening its spontaneity. At the end of this letter he makes a practical application of his position by advising Wilhelmine not to "trouble [herself] about [her] destination after death, because [she] might thereby easily come to neglect her destination on earth."

On September 18, 1800, he continues at length his discussion of the destination of man. "We will," he says to Wilhelmine, "develop all our faculties just for the purpose of fulfilling this destiny." He is still with Brockes, who "is constantly at strife with nature, because, as he says, he cannot find out from it his eternal destination, and

therefore does nothing for his earthly destination, either." Farther on he characterizes Würzburg as a city in which one forgets activity entirely for devotion. He adds a long essay on the destination of man, in which he repeats verbatim the passage concerning Epicurus, Leibnitz, and Kant. It is obvious that he is keeping a careful record of his daily reflections in his diary. The important new step in this letter is the demand for the development of all our faculties. This is the familiar Romantic insistence on the harmonious unity of all the faculties of man.

This step accounts for the enthusiasm and hopefulness of the letter of September 13, 1800. The literature of that time, from Herder to Kleist and beyond, is full of the extraordinary imaginative and emotional force of the conception of the unity which embraces all the universe, all the substance of life, temporal and eternal, all powers and motions of the human mind in one flaming vision. Those that have this faculty of unified vision, this *Gesichtsblick*, as Brockes called it, according to Kleist, are indeed the children of light in that generation.[1] Kleist, the very gifted and imaginative youth, coming for the first time under the spell of that vision of unity, which for every imaginative young person brings about a crisis and an epoch, must have felt that he had found the key to the mystery of the conduct of life. Everything he had known until that time must have lain before him in the rosy light of a fresh and original knowledge. He must have felt that he was destined to lead humanity to a new goal. He was to be no mere office drudge, nor a mere *Vielwisser;* he was to be a new prophet of mankind. This conclusion is borne out by the letter of October 10, in which he compares his "soul" to the "desk of a philosopher who has thought out a new system and written down his fundamental ideas on scattered sheets" ("der ein neues System ersann und einzelne Hauptgedanken auf zerstreute Papiere niederschrieb").

The immediate effect of this preoccupation with the vision of totality is a decided further shifting of his mental activities toward the imaginative and emotional side. For that vision itself is predominantly imaginative and emotional. And so we find in the next

[1] This subject will be discussed in detail in the fourth paper of this series. In the meantime I refer to the "zusammenbrennende, zusammentreffende Ganze" of Wilhelm Meister's *Lehrjahre*, Book I, chap. xiv.

letter, dated September 19, for the first time a highly emotionalized account of nature. Kleist, however, does not yet go the full length of the totalists, often called pantheists, who use nature symbolically as an expression of their emotions. He leaves only very gradually the conventional objective moorings. He still separates external nature and his states of mind, but he does change the focus of his attention by constantly increasing and intensifying the range of the sensations. His descriptions of nature are now subordinated to descriptions of his emotions, of which nature is regarded as the mere external cause. He concludes a picture of a sunrise with these words, "Yes, now my heart rose [*erhob sich*] under [*unter*] my bosom, for now I saw, and heard, and felt, and perceived [*und fühlte und empfand*] with all my senses that I had a paradise before me." Again, when he walks alone in the dusk, "in the face of the breath of the west-wind," and especially when he then closes his eyes, he hears "whole concerts, complete with all the instruments, from the tender flute to the roaring double bass." He is so interested in his emotions that he begins to devise original experiments in sense-perception. The obvious prevalence of personification in the diction of the last quoted passages is a consistent formal accompaniment of his change of view. Further, he tells of once having heard an adagio, "when I was walking 'against' both the Rhine and the evening wind, so that the waves of the air and of the water at the same time sounded around me" ("und so die Wellen der Luft und des Wassers zugleich mich umtönten"). The effect upon him was that of a whole orchestra, and he was so transported that he believed "that all that the wise men of Greece composed [*dichteten*] about the harmony of the spheres, could have been no more soft, more beautiful, more heavenly than this strange dreaming." He can reproduce this concert at will in his mind—"but as soon as an idea regarding it [*ein Gedanke daran*] stirs, at once all is gone—melody, harmony, sound, in short, the whole music of the spheres." The strong and clear partisanship against a discursive thought as the destroyer of his imaginative paradise is an interesting example, to be followed by many more, of his extraordinary alertness in realizing the significance of a new phase in his mental life.

In his studies and reflections recorded in the remaining letters from Würzburg, the destination of man is his chief preoccupation.

The general emotional trend of his development is clearly indicated by the prominence now given to happiness and love as the chief ends of man rather than to perfection and virtue. On September 20 and October 10 he speaks of happiness as the chief good of life, to be attained by "love and culture." He is seriously convinced that he has discovered a new philosophy. It is significant of his new attitude that in the passage from the letter dated October 10, quoted above, he makes the receptacle of his fundamental ideas not his mind but his "soul." After much grandiloquence Wilhelmine's destination is, with a sudden descent to bathos, defined as that of a mother ("so that she may devote herself to the making of noble human beings"), and his own as that of a citizen (*Staatsbürger*), with the ultimate common aim of "das Glück der Liebe."

He has come to a pause. The first glory of his vision of a new philosophy has considerably faded. The enthusiasm of the last letter sounds somewhat hollow and the conclusion is trite. Würzburg, as it appears from the letter of September 20, has nothing more to offer, so that Kleist, who is rooming with Brockes, has to fall back on his old scientific books which he had brought from Frankfurt. In his last letter from Würzburg, October 11, he even reverts to moral allegories drawn from nature after the manner of the conventional utilitarian philosophy of his time.

He leaves Würzburg for a new field of inspiration. After a silence of over a month there comes a letter from Berlin, November 13, 1800. He has reached a decision. He draws inevitable conclusions. "I will take no office," he announces. As an official "I am expected to do what the state demands of me, and yet I am not supposed to examine whether what it demands of me, is good. . . . . I have an end of my own before my eyes. . . . . I must assert the demands of my higher reason [*Vernunft*] against the will of my superiors." He "lacks the qualities required in an official," "order, precision, patience, unremitting application" (*Unverdrossenheit*). "I work with pleasure only for my own development, and there I am invincibly patient and painstaking." He couples love now generally with development. The chief end of man is happiness. "Love and self-culture [*Bildung*] are two indispensable conditions of my future happiness." But he has to face the practical question of earning a

livelihood. "I assume that I have capabilities, rare capabilities. I believe that no science is too difficult for me, because I advance rapidly, because I have even added new discoveries to some of them . . . . thus a literary career would be open to me in the future. . . . . I might go to Paris to transplant the latest philosophy to that curious nation."

It is clear that he has in mind no definite object. He cannot refer in the "*neueste Philosophie*" to the Kantian system, as is evident from the letters immediately following. No one who had any knowledge of Kant could have assumed, as he does, that his experiments and reflections as recorded in the following letters could be regarded as pursuits of science, or that his discoveries, which he has recorded in his previous letters, could, as he assumes in this, be claimed as additions to science. From the fulness of his record and the unbroken sequence of his account we are justified in inferring that he withheld no "discovery" which he regarded as important from his correspondence. He must then have reference to what he calls, October 10, his own system of philosophy, which consists in a moralizing contemplation of the inner unity of his faculties, the full cultivation of which he regards as the supreme end of man. Amid the vagueness of all these reflections there stands out clearly a steadily increasing absorption in his imaginative and emotional states of mind, the development of a subjective philosophy of the "soul."

He proposes that Wilhelmine should marry him soon in order that he may have her with him and because he wishes to avoid temptation. There are frequent indications of intense though never gross sensuality in his nature. But he is determined to remain virtuous. "However, one must make it as easy for oneself to remain virtuous as possible" ("musz sich die Tugend so leicht wie möglich machen"). The inference from this is that his conception of virtue is being imbued with subjectivity; that it is becoming secondary to subjective impulses. He advises her to keep a diary, also, and record in it daily all that she has seen, thought, and felt. "In this unquiet life," he continues, "we so rarely become conscious of ourselves—our ideas and sentiments die away [*verhallen*] like the tone of a flute in a tempest; so many an experience is lost unused."

He now sets out to study in a more detailed manner his daily thoughts and sentiments. The steady progression toward an ever-increasing absorption in his inner states becomes with each letter more marked. During this phase his letters become again very long and elaborate and follow in rapid succession until he comes to another pause just before the climax. The next letter, of November 16, begins with some conventional anecdotes from the history of natural science. He tells of the falling of an apple, which is supposed to have suggested to Newton the law of gravity; the swinging of a candelabrum in a church, which is supposed to have led Galileo to the discovery of the law of the pendulum, and so forth. He infers from these that "*nothing* [his own underlining] in nature is unimportant and indifferent, and *every* phenomenon worthy of the attention of a thinking being." So far his statements are commonplace enough. But he draws a conclusion which marks a further step in subjectivity. In accordance with the teaching of Rousseau, whose name occurs with increasing frequency during this period, he now rejects books as "bad teachers of moral conduct." "Though they tell us what is true, also perhaps, what is good; yet their teachings do not enter our souls." Only "nature" has access to our souls; it is the best teacher. "Nature," however, means to him, as is shown more and more clearly in the remainder of this letter and in the following, the whole of immediate, subjective sense-perception and association, whereas books are the voice of the "world" and the record of the sum of objective experience. He thus takes the first definite step leading to a rejection of objective standards of knowledge and conduct.

In the remainder of this letter he gives a still more subjective turn to his naturalistic inferences. He tells how in passing through the arched gateway of the city he realized with a start that the arch could not collapse "because all the stones tended to fall at the same time." From this he concludes by a significant analogy that "I, too, should maintain myself if everyone should drop me" ("auch ich mich halten würde, wenn alles mich sinken lässt"). "That," he continues, "no book could have taught me; and that I call truly being taught by nature." A similar consolation, he adds, came to him from a phenomenon of nature on his journey from Würzburg.

"I was standing with my back toward the sun, looking at a vivid rainbow. Thus, I thought, some ray of light always falls into our life; and even when we turn our backs on the sun and look toward the gloomy storm-cloud, we find compensation in the beautiful image which the sun offers us." The importance of this account for our understanding of his development is enhanced by the very absurdity of his assumption that he is approaching the secret of objective knowledge at the very time that his sensational and emotional subjectivity is breaking through the last objective restraints.

On the following day, November 18, he continues his instructions. After cautioning Wilhelmine that she must not merely "perceive all phenomena of nature, but also strive to learn from them," he offers a great many subjective analogies drawn from nature. His attention is centered on inner states. But a few analogies become intensified until they are metaphors and similes. He calls a fan with which a girl plays to hide her embarrassment, in the presence of her lover, "a telegraph of love," and asks Wilhelmine to explain the term. Or "a storm uproots the tree but not the violet, the softest evening breeze sways the violet but not the tree. Wherewith has that an excellent similarity?" and so forth. He no longer relies on facts and events recorded by others but only on his own authentic observations.

On November 29, after disposing of some analogies proposed by the docile Wilhelmine, he moves a step farther from his objectivity. The last traces of ethical import disappear now from his inferences. In their places there appear no longer analogies in terms of conduct, i.e., in relation to his moral environment, but solely in terms of immediate sensational import. It is interesting to observe that while previously he offered the external facts before the corresponding analogies, now he states first certain sense-emotions, which he then proceeds to exemplify by corresponding external objects and occurrences: "What is lovely?—A day in May, a peach blossom, a glad bride, etc. What is uplifting [*erhebend*]? A sunrise, a choral in the morning," and so forth. His list of emotional categories includes: "fearful," "affecting," "terrible," "depressing," "adorable," "consoling," "ridiculous" (trying in the moonlight to jump over the shadow of a lantern-post, which one has mistaken for a ditch),

"intolerable," "arousing expectations," "seductive," "deterrent," "arousing confidence," "majestic" (a sunrise on the sea, a British flagship under full sail, a waterfall, and distant mountains).

It is evident that he has reached the extreme limit in this field of exploration. The phase of his development which began with his arrival in Berlin has culminated, and so now, as before in Würzburg shortly before his departure, a pause occurs in his correspondence. His next letter is dated January, 11, 1801. He mentions a letter written two days earlier, in which he has expressed great dissatisfaction with himself. He feels the arrest of his development. He adds a few questions, which really are pure similes in redundant form, with substantially no new bearings: "If a flame flares up higher and higher by creating its own draft, in how far is it to be compared to the passion of love?" "If the stormwind extinguishes little flames but makes great ones still greater, how can that be compared with misfortune?" "If you see the fog which veils other objects but not that which surrounds yourself, how can you compare that?" (I translate literally.) The only difference between these and the questions of the previous letter is that these embody their answers.

A new epoch in his life is approaching. On January 23, after two communications, dated January 21 and 22, he gives an account of his latest actions. Brockes has left him to take an office. Kleist has been introduced to the Berlin "world of learning," which he finds tiresome. It is interesting to note that very soon after the beginning of his intimacy with Brockes, in Würzburg, September 20, 1800, we learn that the friends spend their time mostly together in the privacy of their rooms. Kleist has continued this withdrawn life until Brockes' departure. Constant association with Brockes evidently has satisfied him; and it is not until the loss of it that he turns again to the outside world.

It is interesting and characteristic that Kleist should at this new departure in his life pause and sum up with his usual clarity of perception the chief elements in the contribution made by Brockes to his development. Only it is necessary to avoid a solely objective understanding of Kleist's characterization of his friend. The characterization is above all a characterization of Kleist's own present dominant

ideas, whether it be a correct description of Brockes or not. We have already seen, and shall see still more clearly, that Kleist, being extremely subjective-individualistic, does not grasp the import of any idea until he has attained an inner state of development which would spontaneously produce essentially that idea. His mind, as is usual with minds of great subjective spontaneity, seems to register only authentic experiences. In this letter he declares that Brockes is the only one that understood him. Brockes has a "free spirit." "A deep feeling for justice" manifested itself in him forcefully and yet gently. He is occasionally brusque, but only toward men of learning, whom he usually called "smatterers" (*Vielwisser*). His principle is, "Action is better than knowledge." He is contemptuous of "science" in the sense of *Vielwisser*, but he is familiar with the foundations of most sciences. His principal aim is to bring everything within him "into unity" (*in Einheit*). He has attained a high degree of self-culture (*Bildung*). He makes a sharp distinction between *Verstand* ("understanding") and the "heart." The former he calls "cold"; only the heart is "active and creative" (*wirkend und schaffend*). He has an insuperable distrust of the former and complete faith in the latter. "He always surrendered entirely to his first spontaneous impulse; that he called his focus of vision (*Gesichtsblick*); and as far as I am concerned I have never found that he was deceived by that impulse. "Immer seiner ersten Regung gab er sich ganz hin, das nannte er seinen Gesichtsblick, und ich selbst habe nie gefunden, dass dieser ihn getäuscht habe."[1] His chief virtue is his disinterestedness (*Uneigennützigkeit*). Farther on Kleist gives a beautiful picture of him as a true and almost overgenerous friend, who sacrifices money, comfort, and pleasure to his young companion. We thus learn, in passing, that Brockes provided funds and leisure for Kleist's efforts of self-training.

In the passage concerning obedience to the first spontaneous impulse and the spontaneous "focus," Kleist has summed up his own development as we have followed it in his letters to this point. This absolute spontaneity, which supersedes conscious reflection and judgment, is one of the chief terms of Romantic subjectivity.

[1] The German terms *Regung* (literally "stir") and *Gesichtsblick* have more direct implications of original activity than the English terms available for translation.

It strips conduct of objective standards and turns it into a purely emotional function.

Kleist now enters upon the crucial stage of his development. The devastating consequences of his final abandonment of objective standards proceed to appear as the motives of his further conduct with the same consistency which characterizes his course up to this point. This phase covers two months of brooding, hidden in silence but for one illuminating letter to his sister Ulrike, dated February 5.[1] He is unhappy in Berlin because no one understands him. He is chiefly concerned with his "innermost being" (*Innerstes*). This he can communicate to no one, not even to his sister. Language is inadequate to the task. It cannot "picture the soul" (*die Seele nicht malen*), but conveys only disconnected fragments. He is seized with horror whenever he tries to open his "innermost being" to anyone, not because that being is afraid of its nakedness, but because it cannot be revealed in its "totality" and so must be misunderstood. He cannot take office because he is accustomed now to follow his own ends. He knows that he cannot live with people ("ich passe nicht unter die Menschen"). "Even the pillar, to which I used to cling in the whirlpool of life, is shaken . . . . I mean, my love of the sciences. . . . . Knowledge cannot possibly be the highest end; action is better than knowledge." After some further reflections in a similar strain, there occurs the startling hint that rather than *seek* any highest end we must do that "wozu uns die Natur treibt." For the first time now he interprets spontaneity no longer as an active, but, like extreme Romanticism, as a passive force.

His self-absorption in the holy of holies of his inmost being, his increasing isolation, his insistence on the indissoluble and incommunicable inner totality, his final contempt for knowledge; and lastly, after his praise of action, his passive, Romantic surrender to every impulse of nature, draws the inevitable conclusion of the preceding course of his inner life. Unless a decided objective diversion is forced upon him he is on the brink of a catastrophe. Without a vivifying external influence the very subjectivity, whose authority

[1] *H. von Kleist's Briefe an seine Schwester Ulrike.* Hrg. von Dr. A. Koberstein (Berlin, 1860); H. von Kleist, *Briefe an seine Schwester Ulrike.* Hrg. von S. Rahmer (Berlin, 1905).

he has constantly increased until it has become almost exclusive, must now proceed, with an iron logic, to destroy its ward, the inner being.

The catastrophe takes place a month and a half later. He gives a full account of it on March 22, 1801, in a long letter, the chief passages of which are verbatim repeated in a letter of the same date to his sister Ulrike. His "whole being revolves around one principal idea" which has seized his "innermost soul" (*Innerstes*) and has produced in him a deep and shattering effect (*tiefe erschütternde Wirkung*). This has happened during the "last three weeks" and he does not know how he can compress all the agitation that has shaken his soul during that time into the space of a letter.

From childhood he has held to the belief (*mir den Gedanken angeeignet*) that "perfection is the aim of creation" (*Vervollkommnung der Zweck der Schöpfung*), and this belief had become almost a religious faith. "*Self-culture* [*Bildung*] seemed to me the only aim worthy of endeavor, *Truth*, the only treasure worthy of possession." But recently (evidently in the last three weeks, referred to in the beginning of the letter) he has become acquainted with the "so-called" Kantian philosophy, and he must tell her one idea of that philosophy which, on account of her ignorance, cannot "shake her so deeply, so painfully, as himself." Then follows the principal passage:

> If all men instead of their eyes had green glasses [*sic!*] they would of necessity judge that the objects which they saw, were green—and never would they be able to decide whether their eyes showed them the things as they are, or whether they added to all objects something, which does not pertain to the latter but to the eyes. Thus it is with the *Verstand*. We cannot decide whether that which we call truth, really is truth, or only appears so. If the latter, then the truth which we collect here on earth, has no existence after death—and all endeavor to acquire any possession which would follow us into the grave, is vain . . . .
>
> Ah! Wilhelmine, if the point of this idea does not pierce your heart, at any rate, do not laugh at another who is deeply wounded in his innermost, most sacred, being. My sole, my highest aim, has fallen and I have no longer any.

Since that time he has not "touched a book." He has paced the floor, sat inactive at the window, rushed out into the open, idled in

restaurants and cafés, sought diversion, even "made a fool of himself" (without specifications), "an unspeakable emptiness filled [*sic!*] my innermost being." He again, as in his previous crises, determines upon a change of scene.

In spite of its conceit and naïve dramatizations the letter is obviously sincere. It gives an entirely consistent picture of his state of mind in all its most important aspects. But his own account of the true *causes* of that state of mind is on its own evidence certainly wrong. The change in him, according to his statement, has been brought about within the last three weeks, and is the result of a logical argument, i.e., of his discovery of Kant's proof of the subjectivity of sense-perception. Now, Kleist had studied Kant even in Frankfurt a. O. He had, as a student in Würzburg, Leipzig, and Berlin, continued his studies in philosophy. It is inconceivable that a mind so alert as his should have been in ignorance of the doctrine on which the entire Kantian system rests and which by 1801 must have been on the lips of any academic group. The true logic of this epoch in his life cannot be found in the abstract reasons which he himself assigns to it, but in the motives which have given direction to his development to this point.

Kleist is also mistaken, as the record of his letters from the early days in Würzburg shows, in assuming that perfection has been his supreme end. He expressly rejects it as the only end, and later makes happiness through love and self-culture (*Bildung*) his chief end. He is even more mistaken in assuming that *Truth*, in the *objective* sense, has been his chief object. The entire course of his development, beginning with Würzburg and even earlier, has been an unceasing though very gradual shifting from objective to subjective truth or self-realization. In the detailed account of his letter, dated February 5, 1801, in which there is no mention of Kant, nor even a hint of Kantian studies, are contained all the elements of that development, in a consummation of subjective isolation, to which the Kantian doctrine could not have added anything material. No substantial change in his mind was required to produce the change recorded in the letter of March 22. The change was already complete; the epoch fully ripe. The Kantian doctrine merely furnished him a formula for the appraisal of his state of mind.

From now on his course becomes more simple, because he is less confused than formerly by wishes to set himself deliberate aims. The decision no longer actively to *seek* a course but to *follow* the requirements "of his nature," reached at the end of his letter to Ulrike of February 5, becomes more and more exclusively the motive of his development, which proceeds at a rapidly growing pace.

On March 28, hardly a week after his critical letter, he again writes Wilhelmine. He is quite unsettled. He now sneers at "the dry language of philosophy." He has, he says, fallen into confusion through himself (*durch mich selbst*) and must find his way out of it through himself. He would be "eternally unhappy" if he had to remain forever in this perplexing condition, "with a violent inner impulse towards activity, and yet without an aim." But dreaming in his room will not help him. He must go out "into the open." Berlin has nothing to offer him. In "nature" and among strangers he hopes to recover himself. His coupling of nature with strangers implies a desire, not for association with others, but for greater isolation.

On April 9, after another long pause, still from Berlin, he bids farewell to Wilhelmine, "as if forever" ("mir ist es, als wäre es auf ewig"). He feels like a child that has strayed out upon the ocean and sees no refuge. The "first cause" of his journey, he continues, is really "nothing except an inner disgust with all scientific work." His whole idea is therefore nothing but a great "walk outdoors" (*ein grosser Spaziergang*). He intends to go to Paris to study mathematics and natural science. But his heart is not in such work. "Ah! Wilhelmine, I, a student! in *this* frame of mind!" He will try, however, merely to oblige his friends. "All that people expect of my understanding [*Verstand*]—how can I accomplish it?" How can he study since his real purpose is to flee from all knowledge (*Wissen*)? He has addresses of French men of science, and so "I shall come again into that circle of cold, one-sided people in whose company I was never at home."

On April 24, still from Berlin, he writes in a different, quiet tone. He now recognizes that a period in his life has come to a close and draws his own calm conclusion. After asking Wilhelmine to read over his letters since the beginning of his crisis, he sums up: "This

period in my life, in which circumstances forcibly drew me on to an action, with which one would have permitted himself only to play,[1] seems to me extremely remarkable" ("Mir ist diese Periode in meinem Leben und dieses gewaltsame Fortziehen der Verhältnisse zu einer Handlung, mit der man sich bloss zu spielen erlaubt hätte, äusserst merkwürdig").

His cry now is for "freedom" (*Freiheit*). Neither honor, nor riches, nor sciences can alone satisfy him now. He is determined to forget "the whole wretched sophistication" (*Spitzfindigkeit*, evidently referring to his former attempts of adapting himself to the objective order of society), which is the cause of his "inner confusion."

For the first time we encounter here the *innere Verwirrung*, which throughout his greater dramas, where it appears as *Gefühlsverwirrung*, is his principal tragic motive of character. This confusion ensues whenever a character permits any deliberate purposes or intellectual conclusions to interfere with his spontaneous impulses. The spontaneous impulses alone, according to this view, produce integrity and unity of action and clarity of states of mind. The intellectual activities of the *Verstand* are both inferior and disturbing. He has almost reached the extreme Romantic totalistic unity of impulse.

On May 4 he writes from Dresden. A nature description, in which he compares nature to a fifteen-year-old girl, has a distinctly poetic flavor. Ulrike has been with him trying to divert him, but without more than temporary success. Ulrike's nature—gay, normal, enterprising—is, as he says, contrary to his present needs.

On May 21 he writes from Leipzig that he has neglected even keeping his diary, because he is "disgusted with writing." He praises Dresden. "Nothing was so fitted to lead one entirely away from the dreary field of science, without leaving a trace of any old memories, as the works of art collected in Dresden."

On his first visit to Dresden, about a year earlier, he has no interest in art, but leaves the museums to seek "nature." Now he regards art as the most important subject of interest, because "in the enjoyment of art one has no need of the understanding." "Art affects only sense and heart" (*Sinn und Herz*). For the first time he has

[1] This must refer to his plan to go to Paris.

entered into this "new world full of beauty." More, however, than even by pictorial art, he is moved by the music in the Catholic churches. "Ah! Wilhelmine," he continues, "our divine services are none at all. They speak only to the cold understanding; but a Catholic festival speaks to all our senses."[1] We need only to compare this estimate with that pronounced, but six months earlier, upon his arrival in Würzburg, September 11, to note another radical change. He has now discovered another field besides "nature" in the realm of the inner life, namely, all the arts. But here, too, as the phraseology of this letter and his subsequent development show, he limits the inner life to the sensations. This new step, therefore, marks not a departure toward a greater interest in objective reality, but a further progress in his concentration on the sensational motives of conduct.

To complete the sphere of sensationalism as the sole basis of conduct, only one more step is required: the limitation of the affections to their sensational elements. This also occurs in this letter, in the identification of "sense" with "heart." After a passage in which advice on practical matters is spurned, he adds: "When the heart feels a want, it is cold toward everything that fails to satisfy it." He has burned all his letters of recommendation. "For nothing is more dangerous to a heart which responds to every impression than acquaintance." With this step his isolation within his inner life is almost complete. The only active relief from this sealed inwardness, possible for him who had the gift of language to an extraordinary degree, was literary creation of an extremely Romantic character. We find him from now on rapidly tending in that direction.

He is, however, not yet fully conscious of the inevitable conclusion. But his letters betray with increasing clearness the poetic animus. In the letter from which the last quotations have been taken there occurs a fine passage. After telling of the emergence of the Elbe River from the *Erzgebirge*, he says: "As a maid appears among men, thus slim and clear she steps out among the rocks! Softly, with modest tremors [*Wanken*], she comes near. The noble

[1] This one-sided interest in the sensuous part of Catholic services, and the total disregard of the Catholic doctrine of an absolute authority, which is at the opposite pole from Romanticism, is characteristic of many Romanticists.

sex press forward, barring her way, to look upon the face of the pure and glowing one—but she, without tarrying, with a quick blush, passes through them on her winding way."

On June 3, 1801, in Göttingen, the state of idle sensationalism continues, approaching almost the point of emotional fatalism: "When thoughts strive with thoughts, emotions with emotions, then it is difficult to name the power which is ruling the soul, because the victory is still undecided." He is tired of mere "thinking"; "work" alone can give him peace. But he offers no hint of the nature of the work. He regrets Ulrike's presence, though he cares for her. She prevents his concentration upon himself. He finds writing letters very difficult.

On July 21, 1801, he is in Paris. He writes that he has not yet an aim and does not know in which direction he is moving. He is trying once more to study, but: "Ah! Wilhelmine, these people talk to me of alkalis and acids, whilst an overpowering necessity is parching my lips." On August 15, 1801, again writing from Paris, he is a little more hopeful. He is again upon the verge of a decision: "My senses tell me," he writes, "what my feelings [*Gefühl*] told me, long ago, that the sciences make us neither better nor happier, and I hope that this [intimation] will lead me to a resolution." Finding in Paris a combination of the "highest immorality" with the "highest science," he concludes that science and "culture" [*Bildung*] have nothing in common. He sees the books of Rousseau, Helvetius, Voltaire, and works on natural history in all the libraries, but they seem to have done no good. If at least half of the energy spent in writing had been given to acting, conditions would have been better.

Rousseau, his former hero, is now suddenly banished among the rationalists and the men of objective science. He, too, has become too objective for Kleist. It seems that in this identification of "writing" and "science," which marks a new step, he has not merely lost all interest in science, but has forgotten the last trace of the specific meaning of science. "Writing," constantly used in antithesis to "action," appears in the subsequent passages as synonymous with recorded experience of others. Being thus a form of mediated or objective experience, it is spurned as an intrusion into the

immediate sensationalism[1] which he now identifies with the essence of the personal life. "Action," as his antithesis of "writing," has not the ordinary, objective meaning of the term. There is no hint that even since the early days of his perfunctory pursuit of office Kleist ever projected any practical action; and there are numerous indications of the opposite in his letters written after this time. "Action," from now on in these letters, is generally associated with "freedom" and synonymous with it. It means the absolute subjective freedom of spontaneous impulse within a universe of sensations. He has reached the extreme Romantic freedom, including the totalistic conception of impulse and the negative interpretation of spontaneity. He now draws the inevitable conclusions regarding the ethical standards of conduct.

Kleist first becomes aware of the ethical implications of his course in his letter of January 23[2] as he comes to a pause on the brink of his crisis; and again in the letter of March 22, announcing the catastrophe. Beginning with the present letter we find him passing step by step through all the stages of Romantic ethics, until in this field also every trace of objective standards is removed and subjective impulses are left in complete control. His argument, in this letter, is as follows:

> Without science men are barbarians, superstitious, cowardly, helpless; and with it they become luxurious, self-indulgent, and degenerate. Both, science and ignorance, lead to virtues and vices. And so whatever we do, we may do right. There can be no absolute responsibility; there cannot be anything absolutely bad. What is moral in one is evil in another. The only right thing to do, then, is to live out one's life in accordance with one's nature.

"Freedom, a home, a wife" he now desires above all. It is the duty of heaven to give us "enjoyment of life" (*Lebensgenuss*); it is our duty to deserve it.

His account of the reasons which led him to this conclusion, though undoubtedly sincere, is too obviously absurd to require refutation. The ethical dilemma which he constructs is not limited to science. As in the explanation of his great crisis in Berlin he attributes to logical reason the results of his inner impulses. The true moving cause of his ethical conclusion comes to light in the closing

[1] I prefer the term "sensationalism" to "emotionalism" to emphasize the extreme degree of his subjectivity. Only the emotions aroused by the immediate sense-contact with objects concern him. Emotions aroused through the mediation of the minds of others are spurned by him.

[2] P. 121, above.

part of the same letter, which begins with the statement that he is not yet ready for a resolution. He continues that he must see and feel more clearly until "reason and heart with all the power of his soul produce a final decision" ("bis Vernunft und Herz mit aller Gewalt meiner Seele einen Entschluss fassen"). He is passively waiting for the miracle of spontaneity and interpreting the "soul" as the mysterious force of which "reason" and "heart" are the functions.

A long pause occurs. After nearly two months, on October 10, he writes again. He has one great desire: "To do something good." His heart is "panting for deeds" (*tatenlechzend*). He longs for a great "sphere of activity." But he warns Wilhelmine not to judge his sphere by the standards of the "world." He has for a number of years (his development has covered such a long course that it naturally must to him have seemed to have covered a long stretch of time) "become very different from what people call 'the world.'" He cannot fit himself to any "conventional relations of the world." He cannot accept the estimates placed by the world on institutions or men. A man who is useful to one people may be destructive to ten others. He wishes to do only that which is "good in accordance with his necessities." With this conversion of his impulses into necessities, of "I desire" into "I must," he has practically reached ethical nihilism.

He is afraid that by his aversion to office and science he will disappoint those in whom he has aroused great expectations. But why should he be "influenced by the expectations of others"?

Not until now is there definite evidence that Kleist is seriously considering the career of a poet. Continuing in the same letter he writes that he cannot live in Germany without an office, for lack of funds. He thinks that he might earn his living by writing. But "writing books for money" is to him "unthinkable." Then follows the important confession: "Finding so little for my needs among the people of this city, I have, in a solitary hour, worked out an ideal for myself; but I do not comprehend how a poet can surrender the song of his love to such a rude mob as men are. A bastard, they call it. I would gladly lead you into the vault where I solemnly keep my child, as a Vestal Virgin hers, under the light of my lamp."

The reference is generally interpreted as being to his *Robert Guiscard*. He has obviously not begun definite composition. The

subject can hardly have passed beyond the earliest stages of inspiration and vague project. The most definite characteristic both of the project and of his state of mind is his extreme, hypersensitive isolation from objective contacts and standards.

At the conclusion of the letter he proposes to buy a little farm in Switzerland and live as a farmer. He explains his desire thus: "Only in the world it is painful to be little, not outside of it."

In his next letter from Paris, October 27, he is enthusiastic over his plan to live in the country, and have "freedom, the noblest kind of work, a property, a wife." The "work" is probably, as will appear in the concluding part of this paper, *Robert Guiscard.*

Wilhelmine refused to join him in this harebrained project, which Ulrike also had condemned. After his return to Germany, on December 2, he writes her from Frankfurt a. M., pleading with her to reconsider her refusal.

This practically ends their relations. He is silent for a long period. On May 20, 1802, he writes her for the last time. He is now living on an island in the river Aar near Thun in Switzerland, carrying out his fantastic scheme with the assistance of a native girl whom he calls Mädeli. Wilhelmine in the meantime has lost, through sudden death, her favorite brother Karl, Kleist's friend. She is very unhappy and ill and very much in need of his sympathy and consolation. His last letter, written in reply to her repeated messages, contains not a word of sympathy or regret. It is shockingly heartless. He tells her finally that he has now an ambition to be a famous man and that he shall not return to Germany until he has achieved his purpose. He sums up with the dictum: "That is decided, as is the nature of my soul."

His most immediate and imperious desires are now the sole law of his being. He has reached the final conclusion of his development. He is no longer interested in Wilhelmine. He is hardly aware of her. The humble, patient vessel into which he has poured the drama of his mind ceases to be of use to him the moment the last line is spoken and is promptly, almost absent-mindedly, dropped, as the now complete, extreme Romanticist passes on his way.

MARTIN SCHÜTZE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[*To be concluded*]

WILHELM RAABE'S TRILOGY, *DER HUNGERPASTOR, ABU TELFAN, DER SCHÜDDERUMP*

Wherein lies the unity of these three novels? To what extent may they be termed a trilogy? There is no unity of plot, no persistent character, no recurrence of scene or situation and yet Raabe testifies to an inner relation. The last paragraph of his *Schüdderump* reads as follows: "We have come to the close. And it was a long and hard road to travel from the pastorate of the *Hungerpastor* at Grunzenow on the Baltic via Abu Telfan in Tumurkieland under the shadows of the Moon Ridge to the poorhouse at Krodebeck at the base of the old Germanic Zauberberg."

The usual method of procedure in determining such a question would be that of a close analysis of the author's personality and the conditions under which these works were produced, with the end in view of weighing and determining the reflex of the author's personality and experience in the choice of his motifs, the shaping of his plot, the form and growth of his characters, and his distribution of life's destinies. But the difficulties of such a course are at once apparent, when one considers the taciturn nature of the man. His sole means of communication with the outer world, and for him no doubt the only adequate and satisfactory means, lay in his works. And in the brief period of his lifetime (1831–1910) the German nation grew richer by some thirty-eight volumes of stories and novels written by him. Yet although we have so little supplementary information from autobiographical material, a study of the trilogy in the light of Raabe's contemporaries will, I think, be found very illuminating.

In a certain sense, Storm's development is perhaps as typical of a certain phase of nineteenth-century thought and craftmanship as any that could be adduced. His first serious literary effort, *Immensee*, stamps the youthful author a romanticist, who expresses the fullness of his emotional life in a *Stimmungsnovelle*. His last novel, *Der Schimmelreiter*, depicts a totally different type of hero and points to a totally different outlook upon life. Hauke Haien is a man whose

life is a constant struggle against the hostile elements of the North Sea and the inferiority, superstition, meanness, and parsimony of his home community. *Der Schimmelreiter* is a splendid type of the *Konfliktsnovelle; Immensee* treats of the fame and fortune of an individual in its individual aspects.

A further phase of nineteenth-century thought we have represented in Hebbel. He grew to manhood amidst want and poverty; his early life presents a scene of constant conflict. What further development does he show beyond Storm? His most mature works embody the more tragic aspects of life. He brings the message that the wholly innocent and guiltless too often suffer from the tyranny of unwarranted social conditions. The tragedy of the misfit in its various forms and aspects, the hardships accruing to the individual in transition periods, when values and standards are undergoing change—these are the subjects that attract him.

Raabe shows a development similar to that of Storm and Hebbel. This is our thesis. In the three novels above mentioned he deals with the question, What is life? In formulating his first answer, he begins with the *Entwickelungsnovelle* like Storm. His outlook upon life broadens and he gives his second answer to the question in the form of a *Konfliktsnovelle.* This too is inadequate to express the fulness of his observations, and he shapes his third answer like Hebbel in a tragedy of unwarranted social conditions.

All these novels, however, have their meaning. The third answer to the question, What is life? does not make the first or second superfluous. All three present equally valuable aspects of the one great problem. To answer it implied the closest observation and the fullest experience. "We have come to the close," says Raabe in the last of the series, "it was a long and hard road to travel."

The first of the series, *Der Hungerpastor*, in which Raabe treats the problem of individuality in its individual aspect, was written in 1863, when the theory of evolution was rapidly gaining ground in German literature, primarily no doubt, through the life-work of Goethe. The opening scene is laid in a German village in the year 1815. It is therefore meant on the whole as a treatment of life and conditions in the present. There are two persistent characters depicted in sharp contrast: the one in his development to ever greater

wisdom and usefulness, the other as he sinks into hopeless degradation. What they have in common is *Hunger*, the desire to grow, that force which, in the opinion of the author, is at the basis of all life. Even a superficial examination of the novel will confirm the opinion that its theme is the individual impulse to grow both in its salutary and in its destructive aspect.

Hans Unwirrsch is the son of a poor shoemaker, who plies his needle and drives his pegs under the gleam of an irridescent globe hanging there before him to catch and concentrate the rays of light from a small lamp in his dingy workshop. His life is one of unceasing toil and of golden dreams never to be realized. When death comes his son falls heir to the shoemaker's globe and to his father's longing for knowledge and understanding.

The first step in this direction is the community school for the poor. The scenes described remind us of Dickens. When the master Silberlöffel breathes his last, it is with this sad plaint, "I have been very hungry, hungry for love and thirsty for knowledge; all else was nought."

Hans enters the *Gymnasium*. His mother cannot understand the boy's striving, his groping from the darkness into the light, but with the instinct of love and the sacred memory of her husband's dreams to prompt her, she slaves at her washtub and adds to the meager store of the paternal inheritance. The shoemaker's globe is the symbol of their lives.

The author stops to philosophize. Man is born with the hunger for eternal things; he feels its prompting in an unselfish longing for something that is yet to come. But when the years of discretion are at hand, its sacred impulse is stifled all too easily in a compromise with the comforts of life and the all-absorbing pursuit of its showy baubles.

Not so with Hans Unwirrsch. Love beckoned him and Love stood at his side. There was the sacred memory of his father to guide him, the daily sacrifice of his mother to spur him onward. To trudge along the hard road of poverty ennobled him, for it pledged him to unselfish duty, and it fortified him to strive on without flinching. So his years at the university hurried on all too quickly and his experiences as a private tutor in the homes of wealth and opulence began. There

was a time when there came to his ear much loud laughter—laughter with no ring of joy in it—and for a nature like Hans Unwirrsch's, whose "why" went out to every contradiction of life, this was a dangerous period. But it left him sad, not bitter. The undefined *Hunger* of his youth eventually became a calm, well-poised, ever-present, purpose of life, such as, active in millions of hearts, leads humanity onward in its course and upward.

So we say farewell to Hans, happily married in a modest parish on the bleak coast of the Baltic, devoting himself to a life of service among poor fisher-folk. This is his prayer as he assumes the duties of his charge:

I have gone the way that thou, Father Unwirrsch, hast directed.
I have erred much; and often my heart has failed me.
It is hard to come from the huts of the lowly; *his* heart must be strong midst good and evil.
He who is born in the depths, shall be the liberator of mankind.
There is nothing greater in man, than his longing for eternal values.
Father Unwirrsch, I have followed my pathway and been sore at heart; I have found the truth; I have learned to choose the genuine and despise the trivial.
I have no fear, for Love stands at my side.

And in his Christmas sermon at Grunzenow, the old retiring pastor Fillenius told of the good tidings that gladdened the hearts of men—how great and splendid was the Roman Empire and yet how desolate and waste this earth; how Christ was born into the hungry world and all mankind raised aloft its arms for the bread of life; how the heavens were opened and there appeared a great light, and men and women knelt and heard the words, "Truth! Freedom! Love!"

Raabe's first answer then to the question, What is life? is an answer in its individual aspect. Life is a striving of the noble soul for eternal values. Like Faust, Hans Unwirrsch is led from obscure aspirations through love, experience, beneficent activity, to a knowledge of the "one true way." Like Faust in his last moments, he devotes his life to the service of love on a bleak and storm-driven coast and builds free and happy homes for the coming generations of men. "Hand on your weapons, Hans Unwirrsch!" is the slogan at the close. It means guidance, control, direction of the inner impulse for self-development and for service.

The contrast figure introduced to bring home this truth is Moses Freudenstein, the son of a down-trodden Jewish peddler and dealer in second-hand goods. Moses is directed to know and to understand, so that he may the more effectually shield himself against oppression and the more surely triumph over his enemies. These are the old Jew's words: "You will grow to be a great man; you need fear no one; and the 'cake' you will have, too. They'll have to give it to you. And I'll help you to get the money." Moses grows in knowledge and in selfishness. His father rejoices, "He will never bend his back in humility." But Moses forgets the love that attaches to the penuriously gained wealth his father is amassing for him and secretly despises the childish old man. What is dark in the boy's soul grows darker and Egoism stretches forth its hundred arms to seize the world. His desires are always gratified—gratified at any cost. His father, his friend, a few trusting women, his own inner approbation, his wife—he sacrifices all for his vain ambitions. In 1852 the convert to Catholicism, Dr. Theophile Stein, the privy counselor and government spy on the movements of suspicious personages in Paris, is feared by many, hated by all, and dead to his fellow-men—dead in the most awful sense of the word.

Though this may be a splendid novel, it is entirely inadequate as an answer to the question, What is life? It is as though at this time Raabe had assumed the viewpoint of the ordinary man of affairs, who has no conception of himself as a historic phenomenon, as a unit of life that has been molded and welded into shape by the forces of the present and the accumulations of the past. It is as though he were still naïvely classifying all phenomena (witness the character of Moses) into the one category of good and evil without relation to the causes that make for good and evil. To him at this time life seems to have been isolated and quite independent of its environment. Let man strive unselfishly for the benefit of others is his gospel.

But what of the darkness that too often obscures the vision? What of the chains and fetters that impede one's movements and to which the wanderer is all but oblivious? And even with worthy ideals steadfastly pursued, is the rock of purpose impervious to the attack of hostile forces—to the drip, drip, drip of falling water? It

is perhaps with these thoughts in mind that Raabe once referred to his *Hungerpastor* as *eine Jugendsünde.*

The second novel of the series is his *Abu Telfan* in which he takes up these very problems involving the relation of the individual to his environment. The tragic heroine of this tale is Nicola von Einstein. The parallel figure, serving as a magic mirror of her situation and experiences, is Leonhard Tagebucher. These are the two persistent characters. Both are striving like Hans Unwirrsch for higher things. The Moses Freudenstein of this novel is Herr von Glimmern. Nicola figures as the victim of Herr von Glimmern, who in turn comes to an untimely end as a punishment for his rascality.

As already mentioned Leonhard Tagebucher's experiences serve as a companion piece to those of the heroine. At the opening of the story he makes his appearance with a history that leaves the reader in no doubt about his situation. The study of theology had disagreed with him, he had taken sudden leave, and after many adventures with slave-dealers in Egypt, was himself taken captive on the Upper Nile and held the slave and servant of a big fat beauty, Kulla Gulla, in the land of Abu Telfan under the shadows of the Moon Ridge. Now, at the beginning of events, after eleven years of bondage, with his fetters unclasped, he returns home—penniless but free, free to his native town of Nippenburg, to his parents, to his uncle, and to his Aunt Schnödler.

What is Nippenburg? Like Keller's Seldwyla, the home of the Philistine, Abu Telfan with a vengeance. A community of those dull, narrow-minded souls, whose lives are bounded by the conventional, whose mass-instinct relentlessly crushes the helpless unit that dares to depart from the beaten path of tradition, and then applauds its terrible deed of savagery in complacent self-righteousness. This is the home to which Leonhard Tagebucher returns, the Nippenburg of his golden dreams during eleven years of abject slavery. And the author pauses to remark: "As our acquaintance grew with this splendid fellow we have come to the conclusion that his most varied, astounding, dangerous, and mysterious adventures were not experienced in Egypt, Nubia, Abyssinia, and the Kingdom of Darfur, but here, where by long centuries of established usage the name of Germany appears upon the map." Let it suffice

to say that in the relentless conflict, waged for the preservation of his personality and self-respect, Leonhard Tagebucher eventually gains peace of heart and mind and is able to administer to the needs of another more helpless than himself.

This poor unfortunate is Nicola von Einstein, one of his first acquaintances upon his return from slavery. Nicola's father had been a general at a petty German court with never an opportunity to prove his valor. Upon his death the mother and daughter were left destitute and Nicola was educated as befitted her station by the favor of the duchess. She became one of a brilliant court constellation and was betrothed to Victor von Fehlleysen, an officer of her set. A rascally, but carefully masked plot by Herr von Glimmern, the confidant of the prince, destroyed her happiness. Her betrothed left for parts unknown, unable to bear the seeming disgrace of his father's ruin, and Nicola was left to mourn and hope for his return.

She is twenty-seven when she meets Leonhard Tagebucher, the fugitive from Abu Telfan and the slave of Nippenburg. Her misfortunes have cleared her vision. She sees that she, too, is beating her wings helplessly against the bars of her golden cage. What has life to offer her? A dull routine of trivialities from which she cannot escape, a fairy-tale world with but one object of existence: to live up to the standards of her station. To make matters worse, her mother is championing the suit of Herr von Glimmern, who offers her an assured position in society and a varied round of pleasures for her distraction. Thus she maintains the hard struggle to remain true to her better self. But the hopelessness of the future, the constant appeals and admonitions of her mother finally undermine her strength of purpose. She "buries her heart and takes life as it is." She "closes the book of her hopes and her dreams and resigns herself to the inevitable." (A quotation from her letters.)

Nicola succumbs to the drip, drip, drip of falling water and pays the penalty. When the rascality of Herr von Glimmern is revealed to the world, she takes refuge in the solitude of the deserted mill. Silence reigns about her and no wave sweeps to the threshold of her retreat. "If you knew what I know," says Mahomet, "your laughter would cease and your tears would flow." This is the motto upon the title-page.

But Nicola von Einstein lost heart! True, the odds were overwhelmingly against her, but if she had clung to hope like the old woman in the deserted mill she would have suffered no such shipwreck.[1] Raabe's second answer seems to have been: life presents a relentless conflict in the pursuit of eternal values. Life is what the individual makes it in spite of opposition. And compromise spells ruin.

Is this an adequate answer? Not long, for Raabe. What was he to say of many an unfortunate, who had begun life's journey with him in the golden chariot of Hope, as Schiller describes it in his *Ideals*. Did life here fall short of its glorious possibilities because like Nicola they lost heart in the struggle? Though some may have lost heart, is it not equally true that others never wavered? And then the end came and they greeted Death as the great Comforter. This is Raabe's third answer in his *Schüdderump*, the death-cart.

The scenes of this story are laid in the little village of Krodebeck near the Harz Mountains. Dietrich Häuszler, the village barber, had served his apprenticeship in Berlin, that great center of wealth, and left it inspired with an ideal—the ideal of having a beautiful daughter, over whose destiny he might lord it at his pleasure. He was married in 1820. His wife died at Krodebeck in 1839, a deserted woman, one year after the departure of her husband from Krodebeck with his ideal realized and "beautiful Mary," as she was called, at his side. In 1850 "beautiful Mary" returned to Krodebeck with her little daughter Antonie. This poor mother returned, lying on a litter of straw in a two-wheeled cart, to die in the poorhouse. In 1861, the scion of the Häuszler family, Antonie's grandfather, was likewise destined to return to Krodebeck, at a time when Marie Häuszler's child, Antonie, had grown to beautiful womanhood. And then the title of the novel was to find its fullest exemplification.

There on her deathbed in the poorhouse at Krodebeck, Marie Häuszler felt no remorse for the life she had led, for they had all been against her. Only when she thought of her child, the anguish of her heart convulsed her frame and she sobbed, "They will make her pay for what I have taken." Jane Warwolf heard it and sighed: "Alas, it has been the way of the world for more than a thousand years."

[1] Cf. *Abu Telfan*, pp. 197, 214, Janke ed.

Marie Häuszler soon passed away and brighter days followed. There in the poorhouse at Krodebeck, Hanne Altmann found herself repaid in caring for the little waif during one brief year of unalloyed happiness, for all her seventy-five years of suffering and wretchedness. Then she too passed away.

Upon the estate Lauenhof near by lived a rare man, one of those of whom Jane Warwolf could say: "He lost his way and came from another world into ours and now he is searching for the way home and gives heed to nought else at the wayside that attracts men." He was a retired officer from the Wars of Liberation, a poor refugee, who lived at the Lauenhof dependent upon the good wishes of its energetic mistress, quite unaware that he gave far more than he received. But Frau Adelhaid knew and came to him often for counsel. Sometimes there were tears in her eyes because of the love and charity in his heart.

He was a strange man, too. A man whose life was filled with many misgivings; who strove without interruption by many queer turns and devious routes to probe the mysteries of existence. Ill satisfied merely to become cognizant of evil and to alleviate misery, his heart went out to the suffering and groped about in anguish for the why and the wherefore. A simple man! Not one of those unhappy fortunates whose life is filled with some great purpose ever beyond realization, but a child with the quaint wisdom of years, the inner need to question and the faith that Christ commended.

When little Tonie Häuszler first caught his attention in that miserable two-wheeled cart going to the poorhouse, this knight of Gläubigern did not turn away like Lady Adelaide Klotilde Paula de St. Tronin. On the contrary, he intervened to send the angry mob of Krodebeck citizens about their business and, after the sufferers had been cared for, he returned to the Lauenhof with little appetite for the evening meal and retired somewhat earlier than was his custom to the seclusion of his rooms.

A year later, when Hanne Altmann had passed away and little Tonie had fled in terror from the poorhouse to his arms, he took her to his heart, watched over her, and reared her like his own child. The seed fell upon rich ground. She became the treasure of his heart. "I had grown to be sixty-eight," he confesses, "ever searching for the

missing something in my life—until she came to tell me and to tell us all. For they all lived in want of what she brought to Krodebeck, though perhaps they strove less for it and suffered less for want of it."

Now what a beautiful story it would have been, the author reflects, to have pretty Tonie Häuszler, accomplished, the handmaid of all the Graces, duly installed at the Lauenhof as the life-companion of her close friend and playmate, Hennig von Lauen! For there were moments when he thought in all truth that he loved her. But, alas! 1861 was near at hand, when "the serene blue of the etherial skies above was to resound with Olympian laughter."

Dietrich Häuszler, Tonie's grandfather, had been all but forgotten these many years. Picture the consternation at the Lauenhof when the report was spread abroad that Dietrich Häuszler, a wealthy dealer in government supplies and incidentally the willing tool of the unscrupulous, was on his way to Krodebeck in a coach-and-four to claim his long-forgotten granddaughter. He came and pressed her to his heart and none could say him nay, when he kissed her lips again and again and fondly vowed that they should never part. It was in 1861 that this beautiful girl of sixteen summers, her heart filled with golden dreams and rosy hopes of youth, mounted the *Schüdderump*, the death-cart, though to all outward appearances it was her grandfather's coach-and-four. Not that Dietrich Häuszler was to traffic shamelessly with his granddaughter, as he had with his child; he had wealth now and there was no need of offending his good taste with brutalities. But he brought her to Vienna into his world of vice, hypocrisy, and charlatanism, and four long years in this stifling atmosphere sufficed to sap her strength and bring her to an untimely end.

The tale draws to a close. One more view of the feeble, aged knight, hurrying to the side of his helpless child to tear her from the clutches of her foes. But how pitiful his errand! How ineffectual all human aid! Oh, the agony of his helplessness! Grimly the terrible Sphinx of Destiny directed her gaze upon him with those large, cold, unfathomable eyes. His head sank low upon his breast and feebly he groped about in the darkness. "Tonie, Tonie," broke from his lips. But she understood. "We shall be together," she whispered, "no one can do us harm." And he too knew—knew how

utterly his last brave dash to the rescue had failed—knew too how completely it had been successful.

To those who are earnestly striving for their hearts' highest ideals, Death appears at the end as the great Comforter. This is Raabe's third answer in his *Schüdderump*. Life's course is not a golden chariot-race. It is what society makes it for the individual in spite of his enduring pursuit of eternal values. For many an unfortunate, because of the criminal disregard or failure of society's sacred duties,[1] it is but a journey to the grave where all is peace. This is not pessimism, with which Raabe has sometimes been charged. It is the unflinching utterance of the close observer. When Böcklin painted his portrait, it was with a quiet, pensive look in his eyes, listening to the dirge that grinning Death is fiddling to him from the background. Yet his hand never deserts his brush and palette. For him Death, like Raabe's *Schüdderump*, is not a specter of terror; it is but a further incentive to make life's work enduring.[2]

Thus Raabe's trilogy is philosophically a unit, though not such in point of form.

We have come to the close—and it was a long and hard road to travel from the ideal of beneficent activity on the part of the indi-individual in the *Hungerpastor* through scenes of struggle and conflict with the inertia of the masses in *Abu Telfan* to the contemplation of the tragedy of unwarranted social conditions enacted in the poor-house at Krodebeck at the foot of the old Germanic Zauberberg.

To bring out the salient features of this paper the critical judgment of the reader is directed to the following points.

First, the statements of R. M. Meyer[3] and W. Speck[4] regarding the unity of the "trilogy" were evidently not meant to be exhaustive. Particularly as to Meyer it may be urged that there is no struggle portrayed against "Life's last trump card,

[1] Cf. *Der Schüdderump*, pp. 28, 277, Janke ed. "Die Canaille bleibt Herr."

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[3] *Die d. Lit. des 19. Jahrts.* (1900), p. 568: "Der Hungerpastor ist der Jüngling, der mit tausend Masten auf dem Ozean schifft; in Abu Telfan ringt er vergeblich mit der Gewöhnlichkeit, versinkt in den Sumpf der alltäglichen Hindernisse; im Schüdderump treibt still auf zerbrochenem Kahn der schiffbrüchige Greis in den Hafen. So bilden die drei Bücher wirklich eine Einheit."

[4] *Meine Erinnerungen an Wilhelm Raabe. Daheim* Nr. 49 (1908), p. 8: "Der Hungerpastor, Abu Telfan, der Schüdderump, das Buch der Jugend, das Buch der Lebensmitte und das Buch des Alters."

Death" in Raabe's Schüdderump. Meyer's brief statement may be said, however, to characterize the prevailing moods of the novels, to which H. Junge[1] calls attention more clearly in pointing out the influence of Laurence Sterne.

Secondly, the Gerber theory of a unity of idea[2] is no longer tenable. Brandes[3] protested that it would have been psychologically impossible for Raabe to write *Der Hungerpastor* with *Der Schüdderump* already conceived. The one is simple in its outlook upon life, the other deeply complex. In a chapter on *Komposition und Technik*, H. Junge[4] traces signs of well-arranged plans of structure in most of Raabe's works and comes to the following conclusion: Wenn er eine "Idee" zum Ausdruck bringt, so kann das nur im Sinne des angeführten Wortes von Spielhagen behauptet werden; nie aber "wird die Schilderung des Lebens . . . . zu einer Fabel degradiert," sondern stets bleibt jene die Hauptsache und höchstens gibt die Idee, oder besser veilleicht die Grundstimmung, die Einheit der Erzählung. This position is now confirmed by Brandes' publications from Raabe's *Tagebuch*. There *Der Hungerpastor*[5] and *Abu Telfan*[6] were found briefly outlined. The sequence of their conception is consequently established beyond question.

Thirdly, Brandes and Adler have attempted to establish a relationship based upon the growing maturity of the author, the three novels representing successive stages of development. Their views are open to serious objection.

Brandes,[7] charging influence of Schopenhauer, sees Raabe lapse more and more into a period of temporary bitterness and gloom.

[1] *Wilhelm Raabe, Studien. Schriften der Lit. Gesellschaft* (Bonn), IX, p. 131.

[2] Gerber, P., W. Raabe (Leipzig, 1897), p. 152: "Der gemeinsame Welt- und Lebensgrund bildet die Einheit darin. Eine neue Dichtungsform ist hiermit geschaffen"; p. 153: "Der Hungerpastor führt die Energie und die Erhebung zum Idealen auf den Welt- und Lebensgrund zurück. . . . . Abu Telfan zeigt dann die Unvermeidlichkeit, die Angst und den Ausgang des Kampfes. Der Schüdderump endlich stellt beide, die Energie und die Erhebung zum Idealen und die gemeine und schlechte Wirklichkeit, vor den Schrecken und den Frieden des Todes." Cf. also W. Kammel, *22. Jahresbericht der Staats-Realschule*(Wien, 1907), p. 6: "Die grosze Romantrilogie verherrlicht den einen Gedanken: 'Alles ist eitel' und trotzdem sind es drei verschiedene Bücher."

[3] *Wilhelm Raabe* (Berlin, 1906[2]), p. 10.

[4] As above, p. 65.

[5] *Mitteilungen* (1912), Beilage zu Nr. 3, pp. 77 ff.

[6] *Ibid.* (1915), pp. 76 ff.

[7] As above, p. 10.

(Es ist) "eine Einheit in dem Sinne dasz sie die Stadien seines Weges der Erkenntnis bezeichnen von der freudigen Bejahung des Lebens . . . . durch den wachsenden Zweifel zur reinschmerzlichen Verneinung."

For proofs that the influence of Schopenhauer is a negligible quantity see the testimony to the contrary of Raabe himself as reported by Th. Rethwisch,[1] H. A. Krüger,[2] Fritz Hartmann;[3] see furthermore Marie Speyer's conclusion[4] that Raabe's attitude toward life undergoes no material change. Brandes himself admitted a change of view on the influence of Schopenhauer in 1912[5] but maintains[6] his former position on the trilogy as quoted above.

Adler[7] does not find Raabe's *Schüdderump* pessimistic. He sees the insight of the author grow to the point where, rejecting his two previous attempts at finding a formula for the great struggle of life, *Der Hungerpastor* and *Abu Telfan*, he voices a satisfactory third answer, *Der Schüdderump*, by proclaiming a victory of the ideal forces over the material. "Eine Trilogie kann ich in den drei Werken nicht sehen, auch nicht in dem Sinne Gerbers," is his conclusion in surveying the three novels.

Fourthly, Helene Dose finds Raabe's theme in his trilogy to be "die innere Menschwerdung," i.e., man developing esoterically to ideal form in consecutive stages.[8] Discovering in Raabe an idealist of the purest stamp,[9] she entirely disregards the social aspects of Raabe's panorama of life in *Abu Telfan* and *Der Schüdderump*.[10]

[1] Cf. H. Junge, as above, p. 10.

[2] *Der junge Raabe* (Leipzig, 1911), p. 37.

[3] *Wilhelm Raabe* (Hannover, 1910), p. 66.

[4] *Raabes Hollunderblüte* (Regensburg, Habbel, 1908), p. 43.

[5] *Mitteilungen* (1912), Beilage, p. 87.

[6] *Ibid.* To be inferred also from *Mitteilungen* (1915), p. 62.

[7] Kg.-Gym. zu Salzwedel. Progr. (1909), p. 17.

[8] *Mitteilungen* (1915), p. 122: "Die Gestalten Hans Unwirrschs, Leonhard Hagebuchers und Antonie Häuszlers könnten in ihrer progressiven inneren Steigerung sehr gut Offenbarungen einer und derselben Individualität sein."

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 121: "Est is unverkennbar, dasz Raabe in dieser Trilogie sich als Idealist im strengsten Sinne des Wortes zeigt. Der Geist, seine Entwickelung und Steigerung, ist ihm alles, die Materie, die in dem vielfältigen Wechselspiel des Lebens sich auswirkt, ist nur Dienerin."

[10] Cf. Kosch, *Menschen und Bücher* (Leipzig, 1912), p. 232: "Der Schüdderump ist aber auch eine soziale Dichtung, die tief in die Not und das Grauen der untersten Volksschichten hinableuchtet."

Abu Telfan was first planned with the title *Die Heimkehr Hagebuchers*. Says Brandes:[1]

Von der nachmaligen tiefen und umfassenden Grundidee der allgemeinen Gefangenschaft in der Welt und der deutschen Heimat im besonderen und was damit zusammenhängt, von der politischen Satire auf das kleinfürstliche Deutschland der Bundestagszeit, die sich durch den ganzen Roman hindurchzieht, ist in dem Entwurfe noch nichts zu spüren. . . . . Mit der Frau Claudine und dem prachtvollen Hoffräulein, Nikola von Einstein, dem "jungen Mädchen" des Entwurfs . . . . zieht die ganze Residenzgesellschaft, Adel, Beamtenschaft und Militär in den Roman ein.

Thereupon the title of the novel was changed to *Abu Telfan* with the evident intention, it would seem, of more adequately designating the author's conception of social conditions in Germany in 1862.

In like manner the "Death-cart" is not a symbol of Death alone, but of Death attended by social wrong.[2] If this were not the case it is difficult to understand why Raabe found this brutal symbol so befitting. It is impossible to explain his choice[3] or relieve the bitterness of some of his utterances[4] by pleading a surrender to temporary periods or moments of gloom. Twenty-five years later he insisted upon the truth of his message in unequivocal terms.[5]

In fact, in looking over the critical literature on Raabe we are constantly struck by observations made that tend to confirm the impression that the charge of pessimism against him is due to his interest in the social problem. Adolf Stern[6] says, "Der Pessimismus Raabes hat eine besondere Färbung" and attributes it to the fact that Raabe sees social values he prizes constantly endangered and sometimes destroyed by demoniacal forces of the new day.

Bartels speaks in a similar vein. Says he,[7] "Raabe is seeking for eternal values in personality like Goethe, for it is his great ideal to

[1] *Mitteilungen* (1915), p. 79.

[2] Cf. *Der Schüdderump*, p. 97: (der Wagen) "dessen Begleiter, die Leidenschaften, mit Zähneknirschen und Hohnlachen die eisernen Stangen und Haken schwingen; denn ihrer ist ja das Reich und die Herrlichkeit der Welt, und wer kann sich rühmen, dasz er im Kampfe wider sie wirklich den Sieg davon getragen habe?"

[3] Const. Bauer, *Mitteilungen* (1913), p. 137.

[4] Helene Dose, as above, p. 123.

[5] See the preface of his 2d ed. "unverschönert."

[6] *Die d. Nationalliteratur* (1905), p. 149.

[7] *Ein Vortrag* (Berlin, 1901), p. 20.

put soul into the modern Germany of colossal technical progress and magnitude." After the so-called "pessimistic" period (*Schüdderump*, 1869) he finds[1] Raabe's insight penetrating beyond the "official" Germany, not politically "official" he says, to the whole and true Germany.[2] "Es ist der berechtigte natürliche Pessimismus, ... der so alt ist wie die Welt selbst."

Raabe's social and political views are briefly as follows. He was a strong and ardent supporter of the policy of centralizing power in the general government. He abhorred sectionalism. "Ich habe nur *ein* Vaterland, das heiszt Deutschland." Within the Empire he favored states composed of free communities of citizens like the Brunswick of the days preceding 1671, das dem "angestammten" Herzog die Tore vor der Nase zuschlug.[3] But he was far too deep a thinker to base his hopes of a millennium upon any state reorganization. In his first works, it is true, his protests are often directed against artificial standards upheld by class distinctions and the nobility are perhaps unduly arraigned. But later there is a change of attitude and people in every sphere are valued by their outlook upon life and by their inner worth. The Philistinism of the middle classes is now no whit less reprehensible than the arrogance of the nobility.[4] "Es ist eine der volksläufigen Vorstellungen, dasz die höheren Klassen unserer Gesellschaft den ideeleren Bestrebungen des Menschen immer noch vollkommen fremd gegenüberständen. . . . . Dem ist nach meiner Erfahrung nicht so, nicht einmal im groszen Ganzen," says Raabe in his *Alte Nester*.[5]

Fifthly, Raabe presents a tragedy in his *Schüdderump* that is based upon unwarranted social conditions and not upon the "guilt" of Lessing's theory of the tragic. He is deeply sensible of the influence of environment on character. He asserts the right of the individual to inner growth and betterment of condition and condemns the tyranny of society in its enforcement of artificial standards. The following quotations will confirm this. Readers familiar with

[1] *Die d. Dichtung der Gegenwart* (1903), pp. 63 f.

[2] Cf. H. Hoffmann, *Die Dichtung*, Band XLIV (Berlin), pp. 41 f.

[3] Cf. Fritz Hartmann, *W. Raabe* (Hannover, 1910), p. 57.

[4] H. Junge, as above, p. 117.

[5] P. 144.

the current theory of tragedy that the suffering of the individual contributes to the uplift of society, of which Marie Speyer says:[1] "das ist Raabe's Lebensphilosophie in der Hollunderblüte," will find in the quotation from *Abu Telfan* a distinct note of personal protest against its calm avowal and promulgation.

Ja, ist das nun nicht der krasseste Pessimismus? . . . . Wo das süsseste, reinste, edelste Geschöpf, die holde Antonie, von den schleichenden Mächten der rohen Geldgier . . . . hier vertreten durch ihren eignen Groszvater . . . . erbarmungslos vernichtet, zu Tode gequält wird. . . . .

Aber es heiszt . . . . auch noch etwas ganz anderes.[2]

Das ist das Erfreuliche am Leben, dasz der Mensch für seine Natur kaum verantwortlich zu machen ist, und so werden wir gewisz nicht auf den Meister Dietrich Häuszler und das, was er war, und um das, was er wurde, mit zu finsterm Auge und zu tiefem Stirnrunzeln blicken! Nun hat ein Barbier in einer groszen Stadt, der sich auch ein wenig aufs Frisieren versteht, Gelegenheit, allerlei zu sehen und zu hören, worüber sich nachdenkliche Betrachtungen anstellen lassen. Das Ideal tritt in erstaunlichen Formen auf, und schon in Berlin lag das Ideal für Dietrich in der Vorstellung, eine schöne Tochter zu haben und beliebig über dieselbe verfügen zu dürfen.[3]

(Die gnädige Frau) ist immer in ihrem Reich und Kreise geblieben und hat immer Bescheid gewuszt in allen ihren Pflichten und Rechten, und damit allein schon hat sie das allerbeste Los gezogen. . . . . Ihr guten Leute hättet mich lassen sollen, wie ihr mich am Todestage der alten Hanne Altmann fandet; dann wäre ich jetzt eine fröhliche Magd und sänge vielleicht mit der Mamsell Molkemeyer meinen Tag weg. Aber der Ritter und das Fräulein, die tragen die Schuld an meinem Unglück; denn sie gaben mir den Schein, als sei ich brauchbar für die Welt, in der ich heute lebe. O der Ritter, der Ritter! ich küsse den Staub von seinen Füszen; dem Ritter danke ich all' mein Glück. . . . .[4]

O es ist ein recht süszer und erquicklicher Gedanke in allem Elend, dasz man zuletzt doch nichts weiter ist, als ein Bild in dem groszen ABCbuch der Welt, und dasz der ihr am besten diente, welcher sein Ich am Schandpfahl am nacktesten ihren Blicken, Worten, und Steinwürfen darbot.[5]

In conclusion we summarize as follows: Raabe's "trilogy" is a philosophic unit, representing at successive stages of maturity equally valuable aspects of the one great problem, What is life?

[1] As above, p. 49.

[2] H. Hoffmann, as above, p. 36.

[3] *Schüdderump*, p. 28.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 268.

[5] *Abu Telfan*, p. 284.

Der Hungerpastor represents this problem for the individual in its salutary and destructive aspects of development; *Abu Telfan*, for those "unhappy fortunates" whose life is filled with some great purpose so often beyond realization, in its stern aspects of struggle and conflict; *Der Schüdderump*, in its tragic aspect, where the wholly innocent and guiltless suffer from the tyranny of unwarranted social conditions. Thus the "poetic realist" Raabe, leaving the Romanticism of his boyhood days behind him,[1] links himself in his treatment of the social problem with the great writers of the post-classical tragedy,[2] Grillparzer and Hebbel.

E. O. ECKELMAN

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

[1] Cf. H. Junge, as above, p. 128.

[2] Lessing, O. E., *Grillparzer und das Neue Drama* (Leipzig, 1905), Vorwort.

Was liegt nun im Urgriechischen vor, Lautübertragung oder Lautentwicklung? Vielleicht ein Zusammenwirken von beiden (was auch für das Indische möglich ist).

Die Bewahrung (oder Entwicklung) des musikalischen Akzentes; das Festhalten der idg. Vokalfarben bis in sehr späte Zeit; das Fehlen aller Lautverschiebungserscheinungen; der weitgehende Verlust druckfordernder Spiranten (*s, j, w*): das sind Eigentümlichkeiten, die das Urgriechische als Sprache mit geringem Druck bei normaler Spannung (ähnlich dem heutigen Französisch) charakterisieren. Damit ist die Grundbedingung zur Verschlussbildung gegeben, wenn wir die vorgriechischen Vertreter der idg. "aspirierten Medien" als stimmlose Spiranten (in lenis-Aussprache), also als ϕ, θ, χ unserer Umschrift, ansehen. Dagegen ist phonetisch nichts einzuwenden. Trotzdem halte ich es für sehr möglich, ja für wahrscheinlich, dass die Entwicklung dadurch gefördert wurde, dass die vorhellenischen Sprachen Griechenlands vielleicht keine solchen stimmlosen Spiranten besassen (es ist mir allerdings nicht gelungen, darüber etwas festzustellen), also Lautübertragung und Lautentwicklung zusammenwirkten.

Die aus Spiranten hervorgegangenen Aspiraten fielen mit den aus dem Idg. ererbten stimmlosen Aspiraten zusammen. Das ist natürlich, denn auch nach einer zum Verschlusslaut führenden Minderung kann der aus einem stimmlosen Spiranten entwickelte Laut noch mehr Druck im Verhältnis zur Spannung aufweisen als eine "reine tenuis." Ob dieses *ph, th, kh* im Urgriechischen mit weniger Spannung gesprochen wurde als *p, t, k* (im Einklang mit Meillets oben erwähnter Ansicht), lässt sich wohl nicht sicher sagen. Möglich ist es schon. Jedenfalls dürften sie um Christi Geburt als lenes gelten (wie in bair. *πhɔltn, κhɔpt, τhɔnt=behalten, gehabt, die Hand*), denn sonst liesse sich ihre Verwandlung zu Spiranten kaum verstehen. Dass diese wie im Germanischen als Steigerung durch starken Druck aufzufassen sei, verbietet der Charakter der Sprache; dagegen ist in

jener Zeit, in der ja auch β, δ, γ zu Spiranten wurden, eine Verschlusslösung durch Spannungsminderung wohl zu verstehen. (Ich mache nebenbei auf den bezeichnenden Unterschied aufmerksam, der darin liegt, dass im Germanischen die stimmlosen Verschlusslaute zu Spiranten, aber die stimmhaften Spiranten zu Verschlusslauten werden; § 14 A erklärt das Germanische, B das Griechische.)

Wir haben also in der Aussprache des griechischen ϕ, θ, χ diese Reihenfolge zu erblicken: idg. ϕ, θ, χ > urgr. > πh, τh, κh (oder > *ph*, *th*, *kh* > πh, τh, κh) > spätgr. ϕ, θ, χ, teilweise > neugr. *p*, *t*, *k*. Das ist ziemlich genau derselbe Vorgang wie im Germanischen in umgekehrter Reihenfolge: idg. *t* > germ. *þ* > θ > δ > westgerm. *d* > obd. *t*: Lautsteigerung im Germanischen, Lautminderung im Griechischen.

Ob "der Übergang der aspirierten tenues in die phonetische Geltung von Spiranten auf dem Wege der Affrikation vor sich gegangen" ist (Meyer, *GrGr*³, S. 287) wird sich kaum beweisen lassen. Schreibungen wie $\pi\phi$, $\kappa\chi$ (namentlich in älterer Zeit) können auch Versuche gewesen sein, Aspiraten auszudrücken. Affrikation ist möglich (sie findet sich auch bei den erwähnten bairischen Aspiraten: [πφɪəτɪκɔt] = *behüt' dich Gott*), aber nicht notwendig, sowohl für den urgriechischen Übergang in Aspiraten, wie für den spätgriechischen Übergang in Spiranten.

Die griechische Hauchdissimilation ist jedenfalls erst eingetreten, als die idg. stimmlosen Spiranten schon πh, τh, κh geworden waren, und dürfte wie im Indischen als Spannungssteigerung im Anlaut (natürlich durch Dissimilation bedingt) zu betrachten sein.

ANM.—Der schon idg. vorkommende, aber im Griechischen besonders häufige Wechsel zwischen media und "media aspirata" (Brugmann, *Grdr*, I, 633 f.; *GrGr*, S. 113), wie in *στέμβω—στόμφος* ist bei Annahme von alten Spiranten am leichtesten verständlich; dieser Wechsel kommt am häufigsten nach Nasalen vor, wo gewiss (durch Assimilation) stimmhafte Spiranten anzunehmen wären; diese aber wurden in dieser Stellung sehr leicht zu Verschlusslauten (durch Beibehaltung des Verschlusses des Nasals, wie im Urgemanischen).

18. ITALISCH.—Der Ansatz von idg. ϕ, θ, χ fügt sich aufs beste in die italische Lautgeschichte ein. Die auch in anderen Beziehungen auf älterer Stufe stehenden Schwesterdialekte des Lateinischen bewahren im grossen und ganzen stimmlose Spiranten, während im

Lateinischen (ähnlich wie später bei inlautenden Verschlusslauten im Romanischen) stimmhafte Umgebung stimmhafte Spiranten herbeiführt; so wurde θ zu δ, ϕ zu β, und auch χ wird wohl in dieser Stellung ursprünglich als γ zu betrachten sein. Durch Spannungssteigerung, die dem Lautstande des Lateinischen vollkommen gemäss ist, wurden δ und β weiter zu *d*, *b* (*medius*, *albus*). Beim velaren Spiranten trat im allgemeinen Erweiterung der Enge ein (wie im Böhmischen, Englischen, Indischen usw.), sodass sich *h* entwickelte (*vehō*); in konsonantischer Umgebung trat durch Assimilation der Artikulationsart auch hier Verschluss ein: *fingō* < **θiŋχō*.

Eine besondere Bemerkung verlangen Formen wie *scrīptus*, *vectus* < **skrīφtos*, **u̯eχtos*, für die man Hauchumstellung anzunehmen pflegt. Nun führt wohl im Arischen (vgl. § 15) die Entwicklung stimmhafter Spiranten in solchen Verbindungen zu etwas wie einer Umstellung, aber bei den für das Italische vorauszusetzenden stimmlosen Lauten ist ein solcher Vorgang nicht denkbar. Ein Wandel von *ft* zu *pt* findet sich zwar im Nordischen (z.B. *aptan*, *lopt* gegen got. *aftana*, *luftus*), aber im Lateinischen gibt es kein derartiges Lautgesetz; diese Formen sind offenbar Neubildungen, ausgehend von den Perfektformen *scrīpsī*, *vexī* und unterstützt durch Parallelen wie *dīxī-dictus*.—Die Verbindung *θt* entwickelte sich anders: weil beide Konsonanten die gleiche Artikulationsstelle hatten, trat Dissimilation der Artikulationsform (Rillenbildung) ein, und es bildete sich *st* (*custos* < **κuθ-t-*, *aestas* < **aiθ-tāt-*). Das halte ich trotz des unsichern *russus* für die regelmässige Entwicklung. Die Partizipialformen unterlagen dem Einfluss der übrigen Dentalwurzeln (vgl. Sommer, *Handbuch*, S. 242 und *KE*, S. 89), unterstützt durch die Perfektformen: *iussus*, *gressus* haben sich nach *sessus* < **sed-tos*, **sed*^{s}*tos* und *iussī*, *gressī* für **iustus*, **grestus* < **i̯uθ-tos*, **χreθ-tos* eingestellt (ebenso *fīsus*, *divīsus* usw.). *-sθ* wurde (wie im Germanischen) zu *st* dissimiliert: *hasta* < **χasθā*.

Die gemeinitalische Vertretung von θ durch *f* hat keine direkte Beziehung zu unsrer Frage, da ja gegen italisch θ niemand etwas einzuwenden hat und es sich für uns nur darum handelt, ob dieser Laut schon indogermanisch war. Auch die Entwicklung von χw (ursprünglicher Labiovelar oder Palatal vor *u*—vgl. Buck, *AJPh*, XI, 215) zu *f* im Anlaut, *v* im Inlaut fällt hier nicht ins Gewicht,

da der Ansatz italischer Spiranten dafür ausreicht. Ebenso fällt die von Walde (*IF*, XIX, 109) angenommene, von Sommer (*KE*, S. 50) widerlegte Hauchdissimilation in die Zeit des italischen Sonderlebens, kann also weder als beweisend noch als widerlegend gelten. Kurz, wir kommen für alle italischen Fragen mit der Annahme von ϕ, θ, χ aus, aber wir können diese Laute auf keinen Fall von stimmhaften Spiranten ableiten. Denn dass diese im Anlaut oder zwischensonantischen Inlaut stimmlos geworden sein sollten, wäre ganz unerhört.

So bleibt uns vom Standpunkt des Italischen zweierlei: Ascolis Annahme oder Ansatz von Spiranten, die schon in idg. Zeit stimmlos waren.

19. Germanisch.—Leiten wir germ. β, δ, γ aus idg. ϕ, θ, χ statt *bh*, *dh*, *gh* ab, so schwindet die letzte Spur von Unklarheit aus dem Kreise der germanischen Lautverschiebung. Die in den "phonetischen Bemerkungen" geschilderte Entwicklungsreihe ist dann vom Indogermanischen bis ins Oberdeutsche in der folgerichtigsten Weise durchgeführt. Damit ist ausgesprochen, dass germ. β, δ, γ nicht lediglich zum Ansatz stimmhafter Spiranten für das Indogermanische führen, sondern geradezu die Vermutung *erzwingen*, sie seien aus ϕ, θ, χ hervorgegangen. Die Einheitlichkeit des germanischen Lautwandels hat sicher nicht erst in der Zeit des germanischen Sonderlebens begonnen. Die historischen Belege dieser unvergleichlichen Geradlinigkeit erstrecken sich über ungefähr zwei Jahrtausende; dass aber eine vom früheren Entwicklungsgang abweichende Sprachrichtung durch Umwälzungen irgendwelcher Art (etwa durch die von Feist und Meillet vermutete Vermischung von asiatischen Indogermanen mit vorgermanischen Nordeuropäern unbekannter Herkunft) plötzlich einsetzen und dann über einen so langen Zeitraum ungestört fortdauern sollte, ist für mich wenigstens undenkbar. Man kann nicht umhin, anzunehmen, dass der Sprachgeschichte der germanischen Sonderzeit eine organisch gleiche oder ähnliche Entwicklungsrichtung schon im Indogermanischen vorhergegangen sein muss. Soweit wir einen Übergang von *bh*, *dh*, *gh* zu β, δ, γ überhaupt beurteilen können, muss er als Lautminderung aufgefasst werden; die weitere rein-germanische Konsonantenentwicklung aber ist eine gleichmässige Steigerung. Der Widerspruch ist unerklärlich.

Darum ist meine Auffassung die:

Wie β in got. *sibun* eine früh-germanische lenis ϕ *fordert*, so *deutet* β in germ. *βeran*, *$\gamma e\beta an$* auf vorgermanisches ϕ. Mit den gleichen Lauten wiederholen sich eben im Germanischen immer wieder die gleichen Veränderungen. Die Reihenfolge der germanischen Lautverschiebung stellt sich daher in folgender Weise dar (die einzelnen Akte greifen natürlich zeitlich vielfach in einander über):

1. idg. ϕ, θ, χ > germ. β, δ, γ: Spannungssteigerung.
2a. idg. p, t, k > germ. $f, \underline{b}, \underline{\underline{d}}$ } Drucksteigerung.
2b. idg. b, d, g > germ. p, t, k }
3a. germ. $f, \underline{b}, \underline{\underline{d}}$ > ϕ, θ, χ > β, δ, γ[1] } Spannungssteigerung.
3b. germ. β, δ, γ > westgerm. b, d, g[2] }
4a. germ. p, t, k > hochd. f (*pf*), $\bar{z}$ (*ts*), $\underline{\underline{d}}$ ($k \underline{\underline{d}}$) } Drucksteigerung.
4b. westg. b, d, g > hochd. π, τ, κ }

So wechseln, ganz im Sinne der "phonetischen Bemerkungen," beide Arten der Steigerungsvorgänge gleichmässig mit einander ab—dem Auf- und Abschwanken einer Wage vergleichbar. Der erste Lautwandel ist "vorgermanisch," der zweite (samt einem Teile des dritten) umfasst die "germanische Lautverschiebung," die sich in diesem Sinne wohl über ein Jahrtausend erstreckt; der dritte ist im wesentlichen "westgermanisch," und der vierte entspricht der "hochdeutschen Lautverschiebung." Als fünfte Steigerung mag man den deutschen Wandel von θ zu δ (zu *d*) betrachten, eine Spannungssteigerung, die 3*a* wieder aufnimmt, ebenso wie 4*a* eine Wiederaufnahme von 2*a*, 4*b* eine Wiederaufnahme von 2*b* ist; 3*a* selbst aber bedeutet nach unserer Auffassung eine Wiederholung von 1, womit eben stimmlose Lenes-Spiranten aufgestellt sind.

Grimms Lautverschiebungskreis hat nun in jeder Hinsicht Berechtigung (vorausgesetzt natürlich, dass wir unter seinem Ausdruck "Aspiratae" Spiranten verstehen): Spirans wird zur media, media zur tenuis, tenuis zur spirans, spirans zur media und so weiter.

[1] Anfänglich nur unter den Bedingungen von Verners Gesetz, später in weiterem Umfange; siehe § 11; zu Verners Gesetz vgl. auch Gauthiot, *MSL*, XI, 193, und Verf. *JEGPh*, XI, 1.

[2] Teilweise, denn die Völkerwanderung unterbrach die Entwicklung, vgl. Verf. "Die deutsche Lautverschiebung und die Völkerwanderung," *JEGPh*, XVI, 1.

Hier wie anderwärts weist also das Germanische nicht eine Abirrung vom indogermanischen Lautstand auf, sondern die sicherste, folgerichtigste Weiterführung, die sich denken lässt.

ANM.—Die Annahme, dass *jedes* germanische β, δ, γ aus ϕ, θ, χ kam, wirft ein Streiflicht auf germ. *γa- *βi. Ich kann mich schwer damit befreunden, *γa- von keltisch-italisch *co*(*m*), sl. *kŭ* zu trennen, und *βi passt in seiner Bedeutung und Verwendung viel besser zu gr. ἐπὶ, sl. *po*- (von unregelmässigen Vokalvertretungen kommt man bei solchen Partikeln nun einmal nicht weg) als zu ai. *abhí*. Setzt man demgemäss idg. *k*, *p* als Anlaut an, so hätten wir anzunehmen, dass germ. $\hat{h}$, *f* in diesen proklitischen Stellungen ebenso wie im Inlaut schon sehr früh zu lenes wurden; germanisch *χa-, *ϕi wären dann ebenso behandelt worden wie idg. *χed- (got. *gitan*), *ϕer- (got. *bairan*) oder wie germ. $\hat{h}$, *f* unter Verners Gesetz: der Anlaut wurde stimmhaft. Das deckt sich zwar nicht genau mit Bugges Ausdehnung von Verners Gesetz auf den Anlaut, kommt aber seiner Anschauung im Grund ziemlich nahe.

20. INDOGERMANISCH.—Soweit in vorgeschichtlicher Sprachforschung von einem Beweis die Rede sein kann, glaube ich gezeigt zu haben, dass dem Indogermanischen nicht stimmhafte Aspiraten, sondern stimmlose Spiranten zukommen. Ob diese in sehr früher Urzeit als fortes zu denken sind (die vielleicht gar noch früher aus Verschlusslauten hervorgegangen waren), entzieht sich unserer Beurteilung. Für die Zeit der Sprachabzweigung haben wir jedenfalls schwache Spiranten anzunehmen. Im Armenischen und Germanischen sind dieselben durch Spannungssteigerung bei normalem Druck zu β, δ, γ und weiterhin zu *b*, *d*, *g* geworden. Im Italischen bleiben sie vorerst unverändert (vielleicht teilweise als fortes) erhalten, später aber tritt im lateinischen Inlaut jene Minderung ein, die in der Folgezeit im Romanischen auch Verschlusslaute erfasst. Griechisch verwandelt die Laute durch Druckminderung bei bleibender oder wachsender Spannung zu *ph*, *th*, *kh*, möglicherweise unter Mitwirkung von Lautübertragung.

Für das Keltische, Baltisch-Slavische, Albanesische, Iranische geben uns Assimilationsvorgänge die Gewähr, dass ihren *b*, *d*, *g* gleichfalls β, δ, γ vorausgegangen sein müsse; theoretisch wäre ja ein unmittelbarer Übergang von ϕ, θ, χ nicht undenkbar; er käme bei sehr schwachem Druck und normaler Spannung durch gleichzeitigen Verschluss in Glottis und Ansatzrohr zustande, aber sichere Belege

für das tatsächliche Vorkommen dieses Lautwandels (ohne Unterstützung durch Nachbarlaute) kenne ich nicht. Auch werden in jenen sehr frühen Zeiten die Sprechgewohnheiten der einzelnen indogermanischen Völker noch nicht so sehr verschieden gewesen sein. Schliesslich spricht das Indische entschieden für die Annahme stimmhafter Spiranten als Vorstufe von *bh*, *dh*, *gh*, denn sowohl für *ϕ*, *θ*, *χ* wie für *b*, *d*, *g* (das überdies mit idg. *b*, *d*, *g* zusammengefallen wäre) würden *bh*, *dh*, *gh* weder durch Lautübertragung noch durch Lautentwicklung eingetreten sein. Wir kommen also zu dem Ergebnis, dass idg. *ϕ*, *θ*, *χ* wohl schon in ursprachlicher Zeit zur Stimmhaftigkeit neigten. Sprachen, die heute noch durch Glottisspannung charakterisiert sind (Keltisch und die Satemsprachen ausser Armenisch) haben den Übergang sehr früh, die druckstarken Lautverschiebungssprachen erst später, Griechisch und (Ur-) Italisch gar nicht durchgeführt. Das Uritalische ist stabil, beim Griechischen überwiegt Spannung im Ansatzrohr.

Es ist anzunehmen, dass dieser Unterschied als dialektische Eigentümlichkeit schon in die idg. Zeit zu verlegen ist. Vielleicht haben wir sogar an eine der von Zupitza (*KZ*, XXXVII, 387) angenommenen Ausspracheschwankungen zu denken. Dennoch ist aus praktischen Gründen die Annahme eines einheitlichen Zeichens zu empfehlen, und es scheint mir, dass sich *ϕ*, *θ*, *χ* ganz gut eignen. Wir hätten unter ihnen schwache stimmlose Spiranten zu verstehen, bei denen wir annehmen, dass sie in manchen idg. Dialekten schon vor der Sprachentrennung stimmhaft geworden sein mögen. Ich schlage also vor, beispielsweise **ϕerō*, **ϕrātēr*; **θē-*, **θuχətēr*; **ueχ̂ō*, **θeiχ̂os*; **χostis*, **steiχō*; **χwermós*, **sneiχws* zu schreiben und diese Laute wie deutsch *f*, *ch*, engl. stimmloses *th* auszusprechen, die ja ziemlich als lenes zu bezeichnen sind. Es kommt mir vor, dass das Indogermanische dadurch ein vertrauteres Gesicht bekommt. Die sonst nur in südost-asiatischen Sprachen vorkommenden *bh*, *dh*, *gh*, die der Aussprache aller europäischen Völker gründlich widerstreben, werden durch Laute ersetzt, die zu diesen passen. Der indogermanische Konsonantenstand ist auf einmal namentlich dem italischen und dem germanischen aufs engste verwandt—jenem statisch, diesem dynamisch, möchte man sagen, indem er dort beibehalten, hier nach feststehender Richtung weitergebildet wird—weiterfliesst. Es lässt

sich kaum vermeiden, diesen "Fluss" der germanischen Entwicklung auch nach oben zu verfolgen, seine Quelle in die indogermanische Zeit zu versetzen. Das bedeutet geradezu, dass ich vermute, dass schon im Indogermanischen Lautverschiebungserscheinungen bestanden, wenn es auch kaum möglich sein wird, mit Ausnahme der Steigerung von ϕ, θ, χ zu β, δ, γ bestimmte Tatsachen darüber zu finden—es sei denn die im Anhang vermutete Entwicklung der aspirierten tenues.

ANM.—Wie in den Abschnitten über Indisch und Italisch angedeutet, sind bei der Annahme von idg. ϕ, χ, θ gewisse kombinatorische Lautänderungen, die sonst der Ursprache zugeschrieben werden, in die Einzelsprachen zu verweisen. "*ddh*" erscheint arisch, slavisch usw. als *dδ>zd* (Dissimilation), das sich nach einzelsprachlichen Lautgesetzen weiterentwickelt. Auch für Bartholomäs Gesetz wird sich ursprachliche Herkunft kaum erweisen lassen. Die Entwicklung etwa von *γt* zu *γd*, ai. *gdh*, ist, wie oben gezeigt, ganz natürlich, kann aber nicht in die Zeit versetzt werden, als noch stimmlose Spiranten gesprochen wurden. Die ausserordentlich grossen Schwierigkeiten der bisher angenommenen Entwicklungen verschwinden bei Annahme von Spiranten mit einzelsprachlicher Behandlung von selbst, und ich suche vergebens einen Punkt zu finden, der abgesehen von dem über das Indische und Italische Gesagte noch einer Erklärung bedürfte.

ANHANG.

DIE TENUIS ASPIRATA.—Es ist anzunehmen, dass eine auf Druck beruhende Lautsteigerung nicht den ganzen Wortschatz einer Sprache auf einmal erfasst, sondern in Wörten oder Stellungen von besonderm Nachdruck beginnt, sich allmählich über den sprachlichen Durchschnitt verbreitet und zuletzt Wörter oder Stellungen mit geringstem Ton erreicht. Nachdrucksverstärkung von Konsonanten ist uns ja aus germanischem Sprachgebrauch bekannt genug—ich erinnere nur an Wilhelm Buschs "*tu tu tu verruchtes Weib!*"

Wenn nun nach Ausweis des Griechischen und Indischen stimmlose Verschlusslaute von zwei Druckgraden dem Indogermanischen zugeschrieben werden müssen, so drängt sich mir wenigstens der Verdacht auf, dass die druckstärkeren, also "aspirierten" Laute vielleicht nichts weiter waren als Verstärkungen der "reinen tenues"—dass sie also Vorläufer jener Bewegung darstellen, die im Germanischen und Armenischen als Lautverschiebung bezeichnet wird. Es spricht Verschiedenes dafür. Schon darauf ist Gewicht zu legen, dass der Unterschied zwischen reinen und aspirierten tenues am weitaus deutlichsten bei den Dentalen belegt ist (vgl. Zubaty, *KZ*, XXXI, 1). Wie das Germanische zeigt, pflegen Lautsteigerungen

dieser Art in der Reihenfolge Dental-Labial-Velar vor sich zu gehen; vgl. §17. Beim Dental wäre mithin, könnte man annehmen, zur Zeit der frühesten Sprachentrennung die Steigerung schon am weitesten gegangen und am festesten geworden.

Das Indische hat seinen Stand an aspirierten tenues sicher durch den Einfluss einheimischer Sprachen, in denen der Unterschied zwischen der aspirierten und reinen tenuis dem Lautgefüge angehört, bedeutend vermehrt. Darauf deutet die Tatsache hin, dass wir diese Laute häufig bei Namen einheimischer Pflanzen, Tiere, Speisen usw. finden (z.B. *kuṭheras*, *kuṣṭhas*, *pāthā*, Pflanzen, *pāthīnas*, ein Fisch, *khalas*, *khaḍas*, Speisen). Auszuscheiden sind die zahlreichen Wörter, in denen sich anscheinend durch ein indisches Lautgesetz Aspirata nach *s* einstellte (vgl. Sommer, *KE*, S. 65; ich hatte das Gleiche schon 1912 bemerkt und damals über 50 Belege gesammelt, die ich vielleicht später einmal veröffentliche). Es bleibt aber immer noch eine Anzahl von Wörtern, in denen die Aspiraten auf Nachdruck hinzudeuten scheinen: Fragewörter wie *kathám*, *kathā́*; Demonstrativa wie *itthám*, *itthā́*; Bestätigung: *khálu* "freilich"; Wörter, die Härte, Rauheit ausdrücken: *kaṭhinas*, *kharas*, *khadati*; vielleicht gar Wörter, die mit Kampf in Verbindung stehen (?): *makhas* "Kampf," *rathas* "Wagen," *çaphas* "Huf," *nakham* "Kralle," *çakham* "Ast, Keule."

Vielleicht wird man nicht geneigt sein, auf diese unsichern indischen Beispiele viel Gewicht zu legen; doch wird man sich wohl der Tatsache nicht entziehen können, dass in gewissen Verbalendungen die Aspirata *th* auf grösseren Nachdruck hinweist. Kock (*KZ*, XXXIV, 581) nimmt sogar an, dass in den Endungen *th* und *t* wechseln könnten "je nachdem das betreffende Wort im Satze akzentuiert oder unakzentuiert war." Jedenfalls stehen die absoluten und konjunkten Endungen zu einander im Verhältnis von mehr oder minder nachdrücklichen Wortteilen; *-the* verhält sich zu *-te* wie *-ti* zu *-t*. Über das *-tha* der zweiten Sing. Perf. weiss ich nichts Bestimmtes zu sagen (sollte vielleicht darin ein Gegensatz gegen die schwächere Partizipialendung *-to-* liegen?—Im ai. Dual ist die Anredeform (2. Person) gegenüber der anaphorischen Form (3. Person) meist durch Aspirata ausgezeichnet; stand vielleicht dem *-tha* des Perfekts auch einmal eine 3. Person mit *t* gegenüber)?

Bezeichnend ist auch das Vorherrschen des *th* in Medialendungen (entsprechend dem Stärkeverhältnis *-tai: -ti*), so dem *-thās* des ai. Mediums Impf. und Aor. und den griechischen Endungen *-μεθα*, *-σθε*, *-σθον*, *-σθην*, *-σθων*, *-σθαι*—Endungen, die grossenteils auch schweren Vokalismus zeigen. Ferner finden wir es in gr. Passivaorist. Ob dieser von den eben genannten *σθ*-Endungen ausgegangen ist (Collitz, *Schw. Prät.*, S. 213) oder auf Intensivbildungen nach Art von lat. *iactō*, *captō* beruht, lasse ich dahingestellt, aber jedenfalls gehört er gleich dem Medium in die Kategorie der gewichtigen Formen, wie ja auch wieder der lange Endungsvokal zeigt.

Dass sich der Unterschied zwischen den aspirierten und den reinen tenues gerade im ai. und gr. erhielt, ist nicht zu verwundern. Im Indischen wurde er dadurch gestützt, dass derselbe Unterschied in den nicht-arischen einheimischen Sprachen bestand. Ob für das Griechische etwas Ähnliches gilt, können wir nicht wissen; aber die Entwicklung der stimmlosen Spiranten des Idg. zu stimmlosen Aspiraten musste natürlich auch ererbten Lauten dieser Art Bestand gewähren. In allen andern Sprachen ist der Unterschied wieder verschwunden, und zwar im Armenischen und Germanischen dadurch, dass im Laufe der Zeit *alle* tenues verstärkt wurden, in den andern Sprachen aber dadurch, dass die apirierten Tenues ihre Aspiration wieder verloren, also in ähnlicher Weise wie verschiedene Laute des Oberdeutschen (z.B. $k\chi$) rückentwickelt wurden.

E. Prokosch

University of Texas

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVI *March 1919* NUMBER 11

THE GRAIL AND THE ENGLISH *SIR PERCEVAL*

I

This article begins by endeavoring to settle the relationship between the English *Sir Perceval* and Chrétien's *Conte du Graal.* If, as has in recent years been often assumed, *Sir Perceval* is merely a retelling by a clever Englishman of Chrétien's famous romance, then it has no importance for the solution of the problem of the origin of the grail. If, on the other hand, its independence either entire or in part can be demonstrated, then it may probably contain older elements of the story than the French *Perceval* and may be of first importance in any general study of the grail.

These pages are directed toward a general solution of the baffling problem of the origin of the grail. The English *Sir Perceval* seems like a thread that marks a path into the maze of the grail romances; but we must first determine whether the thread is substantial, or whether it will fail us if we trust to it. In other words, we must take pains to determine the true relationship that exists between *Sir Perceval* and the *Conte du Graal.*

II

The following section is a study of *Sp*,[1] *W*, and *C*, undertaken with the intention of determining by internal evidence whether *Sp*

[1] *Sp* = *Sir Perceval of Gales*, ed. Campion and Holthausen, 1913. Halliwell's edition, 1844, has the same line-numbering.

W = Wolfram von Eschenbach's *Parzival*, ed. Martin, 1900.

C = Chrétien's *Perceval*, ed. Baist, privately printed, 1909. Wherever Potvin's edition, 1865, is cited, the word Potvin is prefixed.

Bl = *Bliocadrans Prologue*, Potvin, vss. 485–1283.

Pd = *Peredur*, see Loth, *Les Mabinogion*, II. 1913.

and *W* can be derived entirely from *C*. In this section arguments drawn from fairy lore and from comparative study of popular tales will not be used, because they are harder to follow and because they are distrusted in some quarters.

If *Sp* and *W* agree in several points against *C* they cannot have been derived wholly from *C*, because considerations of literary history show that *Sp* and *W* grew up apart from each other. *W*, written about 1210,[1] could not have been influenced by *Sp*, which is dated around 1340,[2] and nobody would assert that *W* was influenced by the lost French original of *Sp*. *W* seems not to have become known outside of Germany, and it is impossible to hold that *Sp* was influenced either directly or indirectly by it. The argument is therefore perfectly plain and easy to understand. If *Sp* and *W* agree against *C* in more than one or two possibly fortuitous points, they must have had a common source independent of *C*.

It is worth pointing out that the strong a priori presumption against an English romance like *Sp*, written about 1340, preserving an older form of the Perceval story than Chrétien, who died toward 1175,[3] is partially offset by two contrary a priori considerations:

1. *Sp* is a closer-knit and better narrative than *C*.

2. If the author of *Sp* was using *C* it is remarkable that he omitted the grail episode, which was certainly the trump card in *C*.

The points to be studied are numbered for convenience in reference.

1. *Sp* and *W* agree in making Perceval see three knights whom he takes for God (281–83; 120, 28). In *W* a chief knight comes up later, but P sees three at first (120, 25). Chrétien makes P see five knights (101), one of whom he takes for God and the four others for angels (140–52). *Sp* and *W* relate how the mother told her son about God, and *C* definitely implies such instruction. None of the three says explicitly that she told him of the Trinity, but surely this may be taken for granted. The English poet shows clearly enough that he had the Trinity in mind. When P saw three knights we read:

> Wele he wened þat thay had bene
> þe godd þat he soghte [281].

[1] Martin, *Parzival*, II, xiii.

[2] Campion and Holthausen, *Sir Perceval*, p. x.

[3] G. Paris, *Journal des Savants* (1902), p. 306.

His first question, "Which of you three is the great God that made the world?" is just the question that any bright lad who knew his creed would ask. The mention of three knights at this point in *W* (120, 25) is hard to explain as an independent invention out of *C*'s five. *W* does not lead up to this incident by any previous statement such as that in *Sp*, where we read that the lad set out

> The grete godd for to layte
> Fynde hym when he may [255].

The three knights in *W* look like a survival of something that was more explicitly told in a source common to *Sp* and *W*. The Welsh *Peredur*[1] also has three knights. Chrétien by increasing the number to five[2] has spoiled a good point in the story.

2. *Sp* and *W* agree against *C* that P had a bad mount. In *Sp* the hero caught for himself a mare that was "bagged with fole" (718) and could not run fast. In *W* the mother gave her son a wretched mount (*vil boese*, 126, 23), as well as a fool's costume, so that people would mock at him and he would come home again. The animal stumbled very often:

> sîn zoum der was pästîn
> und harte kranc sîn phärdelîn [144, 23]

This idea of giving P a poor mount cannot come from *C* (78), or from any of his prefaces or continuations (*Bl*,[3] for instance, Potvin, 1209, 1292), because there he had a *chaceor*, or good running horse, from the beginning. Moreover the agreement between *Sp* and *W* extends beyond the mere fact that, in both, P had a poor mount. In both he had a poor bridle as well; in *Sp* his bridle was a withy that he got in the forest:

> Bot a wythe hase he tane
> And kevylles his stede [423].

[1] On *Peredur* see Miss Williams, *Essai sur la composition du roman gallois de Peredur* (Paris dissertation, 1909), pp. 81 ff.

[2] As a desperate measure this argument could be destroyed by asserting that in *C cinc* is a mistake for *trois*. Both Baist (101) and Potvin (1315) read *cinc*.

[3] *Bl* =Griffith's *PC, Sir Perceval of Galles*, University of Chicago dissertation, 1911.

In *W* his bridle was hemp (*pästîn*). This agreement of *Sp* and *W* against *C* in two related details,[1] that the hero had a poor horse and a poor bridle, does not look like an accident.

3. *Sp* and *W* agree against *C* in making P and his mother dwell beside a natural source of water. *Sp* begins by saying of P's boyhood,

> He was fosterde in the felle
> He dranke water of þe welle [6],

and in several other places the primitive life of P and his mother beside springs in the forest (1774 f., 2206 f.) is alluded to.

W in general pictures P's mother as living something like a queen (150, 1–2), with men servants who till the soil (124, 25–30) and maidens who wear jewels (123, 28–30); but in one passage we read that P bathed in the river every morning:

> uf dem plân am rivier
> twuog er sich alle morgen [118, 12].

Since this daily use of the river is out of harmony with the rest of the picture, it can hardly be a chance invention of *W*. It might very well be a survival of an older tradition, according to which P's boyhood was spent in simple surroundings. *C* has nothing like it. He makes P's mother have a household of men and women servants (706–7; Potvin, 1920–21), and employ twelve oxen and six plows (84; Potvin, 1298). This suggestion of a simple life by a waterside does not look like a fortuitous agreement of *Sp* and *W* against *C*.

4. *Sp* and *W* agree in mentioning a vengeance motive. This is plain enough in *Sp*, where it is indeed P's destiny:

> The bokes says þat he mon
> Venge his fader bane [567].

P is an instrument in the hands of fate. He does not himself know what he is about.[2] The mother in *Sp* expresses no selfish idea of keeping her son with her as long as she lives, such as attributed to

[1] C. Strucks, *Der junge Parzival in Wolframs von Eschenbach Parzival*, etc. (Münster dissertation, Leipzig, 1910), p. 34, has noticed these two details. Peredur ranges itself on the side of *Sp* and *W* against *C*. Peredur chose a bony work horse and imitated the knights' trappings with twigs (Loth, *op. cit.*, II, 50).

[2] Dr. G. B. Woods, *PMLA*, XXVII, 534 f., clearly proved this point.

her in *C* (388 f.) and *Bl* (Potvin, 967 f.). She is indeed sorry when she sees that he is resolved to leave her:

> The lady was never more sore by-gone [349].

However, she puts no obstacles in his way and does not die nor even faint with grief. *Sp* says, to be sure, that she felt like dying:

> Hir thoughte wele, þat scho myȝt dy [387].

But in *C* (and *W*) she actually faints when her son speaks of leaving her and dies of grief when he goes.

W vacillates between two contradictory conceptions of the mother's character. He makes her give P a very bad horse and dress him in the costume of a fool so that people by their taunts may drive him back to her (126, 20–30). However, only a few lines farther on he makes her say: "You ought to know, my son, that the proud, bold Lähelîn deprived your princes of two kingdoms . . . . and one of your princes, Turkentâls, he slew." "I will kill him with my *gabylôt!*" is P's quick reply (128, 2–12). Surely the vengeance motive is apparent here.

Later, however, we are told that his mother died of grief (128, 21–22), which vacillates again to the conception of the mother as trying by all means, even by giving him a bad mount, to keep her son with her.

Then we have a most definite return to the vengeance motive when Sigune tells P: "Your prince was slain on your account because he defended your land for you. Two brothers have done you much evil. Lähelîn took two lands from you, and Orilus slew this knight here" (141, 2–10). Later on we have evidence that P remembered his resolve to kill Lähelîn. After the Red Knight is dead P thinks that perhaps this is Lähelîn:

> du maht wol wesen Lähelîn
> von dem mir klaget diu muoter mîn [154, 25–26].

That *W* wavers between two ideas, now representing the mother as fainting at the thought of her son's departure, now putting in her mouth the motive of vengeance, is a pretty good proof that he found the latter in his source and is not inventing it. Had it been an addition out of his own fancy, surely he would have altered the context so as to conform to it.

5. Professor Griffith argues[1] that the account of the father in *Sp* and *W* could never have been drawn from *C*, or even from *C* plus *Bl*. *Sp* and *W* relate that P's father fought in a tournament at the time of his marriage. Nothing corresponds to this in *C*, but *Bl* tells of a tournament in which the father was slain (Potvin, 645 f.). It is possible to suppose that *Sp* and W got the idea of a tournament from the fragment *Bl*, and that purely by chance they both connected it with the father's marriage; but the trouble is, as Griffith shows, that *Sp* and *W* both connect the tournament with tales of strife, which (though at first glance they may look a little different) are pretty much the same in plot.

Griffith says: "In *Sp* the father overthrows the Red Knight and the Black Knight (Tent Lord) at the marriage tournament; afterwards the Red Knight slays the father; later the hero slays the Red Knight and overthrows the Black Knight."

"In *W* the father overthrows Lähelîn at the marriage tournament; later Lähelîn[2] conquers two kingdoms which the hero should have inherited; Lähelîn's brother is Orilus (Tent Lord). Orilus has slain Galoes, the father's brother; the hero overthrows Orilus."

In the marriage tournament then, in both *Sp* and *W*, the father made an enemy (Tent Lord), who is later to do battle against the son. Since there is nothing like this in *C* or *Bl*, and it is too complicated to be invented separately by accident, *Sp* and *W* must have used some traditional material that is independent of *C*.

In five points, therefore, *Sp* and *W* agree against *C:* (*a*) P's meeting three knights, with an implied reference to the Trinity; (*b*) P's having a bad mount and a poor bridle; (*c*) P's daily use of a river or a spring; (*d*) P's having a task of vengeance; (*e*) the father's marriage tournament, with a tale of strife.

One or two of these points might at a pinch be fortuitous, but not the entire five. It would be pleasant, of course, to find more than five,[3]

[1] R. H. Griffith, *op. cit.*, pp. 19–25.

[2] Professor Bruce, *Romanic Review*, IV (1913), 127, n. 6, objects that Lähelîn does not correspond to the Red Knight. It is true that to make the parallel perfect Lähelîn and the Red Knight Ither should be one and the same. It is curious, to say the least, that *P*, after he has killed the Red Knight, thinks that it is Lähelîn (154, 25, quoted above). Strucks, *op. cit.*, p. 46, has noticed this.

[3] Doubtless scholars will be able to detect other unmistakable coincidences between *Sp* and *W* against *C*. I refrain from mentioning here a number of minor points, because

but five unmistakable agreements are enough. Why insist on more than enough? The evidence has nothing obscure or hazy about it. Anybody who will read *Sp*, *W*, and *C* and follow the facts outlined above must conclude[1] that *Sp* and *W* are independent of *C*, or at least that a strong presumption for their independence is established. Incidentally this implies that *W* had another source besides *C*, no doubt the Kyôt[2] to whom Wolfram refers (416, 20 *et al.*).

Not much that is new has been set forth thus far,[3] but an effort has been made to present the points more clearly and to free them from entanglement with other matters. In the next section another document, which has never before been definitely used for this purpose, will be brought into the discussion.

III

This section is a study of *Sp*, *L*,[4] and *C* and aims to determine whether *Sp* and *L* can be derived entirely from *C*. The relationship of *Sp* to *L* is of course different from that of *Sp* to *W*, for *L* tells a

some might consider them fortuitous. The late Professor R. B. Pace (*MLN*, XXXI, [1916], 53–54) showed that *Sp*, *W*, *Pd*, and *C* describe the death wound of the Red Knight in almost exactly the same way, except that the three former omit the phrase, "the blood and brains flew out." By comparing other passages Pace proved that this phrase was a favorite with *C*. Clearly *C* added this phrase to what is in *Sp*, *W*, and *Pd*. To assert that *Sp*, *W*, and *Pd*, working separately, all dropped the phrase but kept the rest exact would be absurd.

[1] Golther, *Literaturblatt*, XXXIII (1912), col. 395, has taken the only way out by hinting that *Sp*, *W*, and *Pd* must have used a different manuscript of *C* from any that we know: "Sie beweisen einige von dem bisher bekannten französischen Hs. abweichende Lesarten oder Mehrverse, keine besonderen älteren Vorlagen." Nothing supports this assumption. This arbitrary way of setting aside plain evidence was probably suggested by Foerster, *Erec* (1909), p. xxviii: "eine ältere bessere Handschrift von Kristian," etc.

[2] Miss Weston, *Legend of Sir Perceval*, I, 72 f., based upon four or more significant coincidences between *Bl* and *W* against *C* a strong argument for the existence of Kyôt. In order to overthrow this argument some will perhaps maintain that *Bl* may be old enough to have been used by *W*, but this is highly improbable. See Griffith, *op. cit.*, p. 27, n. 2.

[3] Practically all the preceding parallels have been noticed in one way or another by Miss Weston, Miss Williams, Dr. Strucks, or Dr. Griffith. This chapter would be unnecessary except for the writings of a group of scholars, of whom Foerster and Golther were the leaders, who were committed to the belief that all Arthurian romances rest upon Chrêtien; that he began and almost invented French Arthurian romance. By charges that any other view is "mystical," and by vehement assertion without evidence (cf. Foerster's review of Campion and Holthausen, *ZFRP*, XXXVIII [1914], 116–18), this school gained considerable applause from those who are not greatly at home in mediaeval literature and folklore. Foerster's skeptical position is so simple, they say, and it requires no previous study to understand it. As if literary problems were usually simple! The studies of recent years are making it clearer and clearer that Arthurian stories existed in French before Chrêtien, although possibly these were for the most part short *contes* and not full-grown romances, till he set the style.

[4] *L* = *Lanzelet*, by Ulrich von Zatzikhoven, ed. K. A. Hahn, 1845.

different story about a different hero. Any coincidences between *Sp* and *L* are to be explained, no doubt, by supposing that both go back to fairy stories, presumably of Celtic origin, that were parallel in plot and were therefore in agreement in some fundamental points.

Hitherto no attention has been paid to the parallelism[1] between *Sp* and *L*. If *Sp* and *L* agree against *C*, either both must go back to something older than *C*, or they must have influenced each other. The points of agreement are:

1. *Sp* and *L* agree that it was the hero's manifest destiny to slay a Red Knight. According to *Sp* this knight wore marvelous armor (139) and could be slain by nobody else (562–68). In *L* the hero was brought up by a *merminne* (193 f.) for the express purpose of slaying an oppressor named Iweret, who lived in a marvelous land and was almost invincible (328–48, 3564–3600). Iweret carried a red shield:

> sîn schilt was, als er wolde
> von sinopele rôt genuoc [4420]

There is a Red Knight in *C*, but nothing is said about P's being destined or brought up to slay him.

2. *Sp* and *L* agree that the mother (in *L* the foster-mother) gave her son arms. Of all her husband's fair gear Lady Acheflour chose but one thing: "a lyttill Scottes spere" (191). She took this javelin with her to the woods so that her son might have it to use when he grew older (189–93), and it is given prominence in the story, being mentioned a dozen times or more. With this javelin P killed the Red Knight (690 f.).

Sp could not have derived from *C* the idea of a mother treasuring up a weapon for her son to use. In *C* the mother gave her son no weapons, but instead she took away two of three javelins that he carried, "lest he should seem too Welsh." "She would have taken them all if she could" (585–91).

But in *L* the *merminne* gave the hero a horse, armor as white as a swan, a sword, and a shield (349–74). He used these arms in killing Iweret, just as P did his javelin in killing the Red Knight. The parallel seems a fundamental one.

[1] Hertz (*Parzival* [1898], p. 440) and J. L. Weston (*Legend of Sir Lancelot*, [1901], pp. 26 f.) mentioned that there was a parallelism; but Miss Weston made no use of it in her *Legend of Sir Perceval*, 1906–9.

3. *Sp* and *L* agree that the hero did not guide his horse in the usual fashion. In *Sp*, as has been noticed in the last section, the hero had no bridle, but used a withy to "kevylle his stede" (424). In *L* the hero had never ridden before and did not know the use of a bridle. He held on by the saddlebow and allowed the reins to dangle about the horse's neck (404–12; 492–97). *C* says that the hero did not know the use of spurs, but urged his horse with a stick, and had never seen stirrups, having doubtless ridden his *chaceor* bareback:

> Ainz mes estrié veü n'avoit
> Ne d'esperon rien ne savoit [1165; Potvin, 2380].

The bridle is not mentioned at all, however, so that this agreement of *Sp* and *L* that the hero did not guide his horse in the usual manner cannot have been extracted from *C*.

4. *Sp* and *L* agree that the hero and his mother (in *L*, a foster-mother) lived by a natural source of water. That *W* mentions the hero's bathing in the river every morning has been mentioned above. This simple life by a natural body of water is paralleled in *L*, where the hero is brought up in *Meidelant* (4685), which was no doubt originally under a lake, but was at any rate surely thought of as beside a water. The foster-mother sent aquatic monsters against the boy so that he might learn to defend himself:

> siu besante merwunder
> und hiez in lêren schirmen [278].

He left the land in a boat steered by a "*merwîp*" (390). A simple life by a natural source of water is therefore suggested in *L*, as in *Sp* and *W*. *C* does not even mention the presence of any natural source of water near where the mother and son lived.

Bl mentions a large river in the Waste Forest near the spot where the mother built her *maison* (Potvin, 1162–63). But in *Bl* the mother took to the forest her major-domo (971), many servants (1202), and more than one hundred cartloads of food and treasure, besides cattle and sheep (1121–25), so that the idea in *W* of daily bathing in a river, or in *Sp* of drinking from a spring, could not easily have been extracted from *Bl*.

Sp, *L*, and *W*, therefore, with their suggestion of a simple life by a natural source of water, are in substantial agreement against *C* and *Bl*.

5. *Sp* and *L* agree against *C* in hinting that the hero was brought up in the Land of Women. In *Sp* this is nowhere explicitly stated. Two phrases are used which point that way, but which are ambiguous and might possibly be differently interpreted: P says to his mother: "I saw never ȝit no men" (406); after his departure he recalls that his mother is now left all "manless":

> My modir all manles
> Leved I thare [1787].

When it is considered that Acheflour took with her to the forest only a maiden (182) and a troop of goats on the milk of which to live (187), the meaning "only women" for the phrase "no men" seems rather distinctly indicated. P had therefore never seen any human beings except his mother and the maid.[1] He rides upon a mare, which was a mount used by women and was evidently all that was obtainable in the Land of Women.

In *L* the hero was brought up by a *fée:*

> ein wîsiu merminne
> diu was ein küniginne [193].

He lived in "Meidelant" (4685), where there were no men (199) but only the queen and 10,000 ladies (196).

This agreement of *Sp* and *L* could not possibly have been suggested by *C*. In *C*, *Bl*, and *W* the lady had many servants, men as well as women.

In five points, therefore, *Sp* and *L* agree against *C:* (*a*) the hero's destiny to slay a Red Knight, (*b*) the mother's gift of arms, (*c*) the hero's not guiding his horse in the usual way, (*d*) the simple life of mother and son by a natural source of water, and (*e*) the presence of women only where the mother lived.

Here, as in the case of *Sp* and *W*, the number of coincidences against *C* is not great; but it is enough to make the hypothesis of chance agreement untenable. *Sp* and *L* either had a common source independent of *C*, or, both having been derived from *C*, they have influenced each other.

[1] In *Bl* the mother made *P* think that there were no other people in the world (Potvin, 1224–29). Since in *Bl* the mother had many servants and a major-domo with eight sons, this idea is absurd. It must be a survival from some earlier form of the story that is better preserved in *Sp* and *L*.

Of course *Sp* is too late to have influenced *L*;[1] but the lost French romance upon which *Sp* is founded may be conjectured to be old enough to have been known to the author of *L*. The slightest examination, however, shows that if there was any influence it must have been the other way around. Everything is better motivated in *L*. Here we can see why the foster-mother gave her son arms, why she lived by a lake, why only women were with her, why she is regarded as a queen, and the like.

If we turn our hypothesis around and imagine that *L* had influenced *Sp*, we shall not find the idea much more plausible. The coincidences noted are not close enough to be due to direct borrowing by *Sp* from *L*, or from the lost French romance, of which *L* is presumably a pretty literal translation. The natural explanation of the five coincidences is that both *Sp* and *L* rest upon a body of tradition which was older than *C*.

The evidence is greatly strengthened by the fact that three of the agreements of *Sp* and *L* against *C* are almost identical with agreements which were pointed out in the last section between *Sp* and *W* against *C*, namely: (*a*) the hero's having a task of vengeance, (*b*) the hero's having a poor bridle or not holding his bridle, and (*c*) the simple life of mother and son by a natural source of water.

The five agreements between *Sp* and *L* against *C*, added to the five agreements between *Sp* and *W* against *C*, together with the important circumstance that in three cases *Sp*, *W*, and *L* all three agree against *C*, constitute a body of evidence that must stagger anybody who is open at all to conviction. Arguments of a tenuous character and arguments from folklore have been excluded, and only plain facts have been used. The only conclusion that will commend itself to clear-thinking men is that *Sp*, *W*, and *L* did not, upon the basis of Chrétien's work, including the prefaces and continuations, invent all that they tell. They had sources in older tradition.

IV

Two episodes are much better told in *Sp* than in *C* or *W*. If *Sp* had for sources nothing but Chrétien's *Perceval*, stray folklore, and his own fancy, this is an unaccountable phenomenon. It can be

[1] *Lanzelet* was written about 1194; cf. *Romania*, X, 465 f.

made plausible only by assuming, against all probability, that the author of *Sp* was a highly original and inventive artist, who built up coherent episodes out of a few hints in Chrétien's narrative.[1] Very little evidence can be found in *Sp* to show that its author was superior in originality to the common run of English translators of French Arthurian romances. The Englishman who wrote *Ywain and Gawain*, for example, was above the average. He even made one or two slight improvements of a phrase or two over Chrétien's *Yvain*,[2] but nothing at all resembling the astonishingly skilful and extensive alterations that *ex hypothesi* the author of *Sp* made. The natural explanation of two episodes which follow is that *Sp* is here better than *C*, because its author had a better original.

Sp tells in a perfectly clear way that Perceval, when he found it impossible to remove the Red Knight's armor, recalled his mother's counsel:

> When my dart solde broken be,
> Owte of þe iren bren the tree [750]

No such counsel has been mentioned, but this makes no difficulty. It is unreasonable to suppose that all that the mother ever said to her son should be told in the romance. When Perceval found that he could not get the Red Knight's body out of the armor, he built a great fire and made preparations to burn it out (753–84). Gawain arrived in time to show P how to take the armor off. There is nothing of this in *W*.

C tells nothing about Perceval's trying to burn the Red Knight out of his armor. The idea is merely alluded to by P, who while trying to unlace the dead knight's armor remarked to Yonès that he would rather burn the dead body out than not get the arms:

> Mes einz avrai par charbonees
> Trestot esbraoné le mort
> Que nule des armes emport [1114]

If *C* had an original which here resembled *Sp*, we can perfectly well see that he would find P's clumsy preparations to burn the dead man out of his armor lacking in refinement and would shorten the narrative by making the hero merely allude in the words just quoted

[1] This assumption is made by Professor Bruce, *Romanic Review*, IV (1913), 128.

[2] See my discussion of *Owain* in *Romanic Review*, III (1912), 148.

to the possibility of resorting to burning.[1] To reverse the hypothesis and ask us to believe that the author of *Sp* invented his long incident, which is interlocked with the Witch Mother episode, out of these three cryptic verses in *C* is an unlikely explanation.

Another episode in which *Sp* is better than *C* occurs in *C*, 535, and *W*, 127, 27–29, where the mother counsels her son to take a ring from a damsel if he can. In *Sp* this counsel is not mentioned but is implied by P's taking a ring (in exchange to be sure) from the first damsel whom he meets. But *Sp*, the very version that omits the mother's explicit counsel, is the only one of the three to reveal the original sense of it. In *Sp* the ring that P took from the Damsel of the Hall (474) contained a talismanic stone that preserved the bearer from death or injury (1861). Every reader of fairy tales will perceive that this is a *Märchen* situation. The mother had knowledge of the future (or was a *fée*). She knew that the first damsel whom her son met would have a talismanic ring that alone could enable him to carry out his vengeance for his father's death. She therefore, knowing by her marvelous power that she could direct him to the right damsel, counseled him to "take a ring from a damsel." The Red Knight had marvelous armor (139), and the wise mother was aware that talisman could be conquered only by talisman.

For a mother to advise her son to take a ring from any damsel whom he sees is a crazy idea. There is no state of society in which a mother would advise her boy to steal ladies' jewelry. *C* tries hard to make the advice seem less absurd by having the mother tell him to take her ring, or her girdle, or her purse, if by love or by request she would give it:

> E s'ele a enel an son doi
> Ou s'a ceinture ou aumosniere,
> Se par amor ou par proiere
> Le vos done, bon m'iert e bel
> Que vos an portoiz son anel.
> De l'anel prendre vos doin gié
> E de l'aumosniere congié [530].

[1] *C* presents the Red Knight's visit and his insult to King Arthur indirectly by making the king recount them. It would seem that here and elsewhere *C* chooses to have a rough scene related, rather than presented as actually occurring, in order to keep a refined tone to his narrative. See Griffith, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

The young Perceval evidently understood this advice to be to take a ring by force, and he did so from the first damsel he met, thereby causing her to weep bitterly (690–737, 778–81; cf. *W* 131, 16–17). Perceval is very attentive to advice that he receives, so there is much reason to suppose that in *C*'s original the mother's advice was to take a ring by force if necessary. Such advice is absurd (except in a fairy tale) and *C* has softened it, without, however, making any real sense out of the incident.[1]

Scholars who believe that *Sp* has been constructed out of *C* as a basis ask us to think of the author as an inventive artist who picked up a loose end in *C* and made something very clever out of it. He was familiar with fairy tales, they think,[2] and out of *C*'s few and rather absurd lines developed a good fairy-lore ring that plays a part in his plot. If, however, he knew fairy tales, why did he not tell one, instead of tackling the vastly more difficult task of constructing a pretty good one out of puzzle pieces chosen here and there in *C*? If the author of *Sp* did develop his good plot out of such hints as he could find in *C*, he must have been a master of plot invention, and Chrétien is not worthy to be named in the same breath with him.

V

Professor Griffith has demonstrated that a hero who, after killing a Red Knight and a Witch Mother, is entertained by an Uncle, occurs in a number of Scotch and Irish fairy tales.[3] Nearly all the details

[1] A favorite argument of Golther has been expressed by him recently as follows in the *Literaturblatt* (1918), cols. 86–88: "Ich verstehe die Ansicht derer nicht, die eine schöne, einheitlich wirkende dichterische Ueberlieferung immer nur als alt und ursprünglich sich zurechtlegen; viel mehr erkenne ich auch in den mittelalterlichen Gedichten die fortschreitende Entwicklung des Stoffes in der Hand gestaltungsmächtiger erfinderischer Verfasser." The argument begs the question. It assumes that the romance does not come from a fairy tale. If after all it does come from a fairy tale, then the older form of the story will be more logical, for it will conform to fairy logic. When a fairy plot is rationalized it is frequently left poorly motivated.

For example, Shakespeare in *King Lear* used what was in origin a folk-tale about a king who, having three daughters, two bad and one good, divided his kingdom according to the protestations of love made by the daughters. This is perfectly coherent in a folk-tale where people act, as fairy-folk do, according to fixed laws; but when Shakespeare made the folk-tale figures into real people the king's action was left poorly motivated.

On the lack of adequate motive caused by rationalization, see Kittredge, *A Study of Gawain and the Green Knight*, pp. 240, 249.

[2] Cf. Golther, Munich *Sitzungsberichte*, Phil.-Hist. Classe, II (1890), 205.

[3] Griffith, *op. cit.*, justly points out that Alfred Nutt had indicated the chief of these in his *Studies on the Legend of the Holy Grail*, 1888.

in the fairy tales are more primitive and *Märchen*-like in character than in *Sp*. The Red Knight Witch Mother appears to be one of those *Märchen* formulas which we are learning to think of as vastly older than any epic or romance. *Sp* could not have derived this formula from *C* or his continuations, because in the French romances the Red Knight and the Uncle are disconnected figures, and the Witch Mother does not appear.[1] *Sp* must have derived the formula, at some removes of course, from *Märchen* and not from *C*.

Griffith has with much industry shown that the Red-Knight-Witch-Uncle theme is so interwoven with almost everything in *Sp* as to make it unthinkable that the author of *Sp* got the Red Knight and the Uncle from *C* and then worked them into a plot which he knew from folk-tales. He has disposed of the idea[2] that *Sp* used *C*, but he has turned *C* into a kind of folk-tale.

A Red Knight, a Witch Mother, a Fated Hero, a Castle of Maidens, and an Enchantment of Britain, are all in *Sp*. The enchantment is implied, as we shall see, by King Arthur's being "seke and sare" (1078), and by his saying:

> In my londe wot I no lordyng
> Es worthy to be a knyghte [1086].

They also occur together in a French prose romance, *Suite de Merlin*.[3] The Red Knight is here named Oriols and is a son of a Witch called

[1] In Gerbert (Potvin, V, 183 f.; *The Library* [January, 1904], p. 73) P slays *une vieille*, who like the Witch Mother can bring the dead to life, and who is an enemy to the Uncle (Gornumans). There is no Red Knight in Gerbert. It would be a wild hypothesis to suppose that *Sp* got his Witch Mother from this *vieille*.

[2] It is unfortunate that the confused and unconvincing chapters on Saracen influence and on the geographical origin of *Sp*, which Griffith arranged prominently at the end of his book, tend to conceal from the readers his valuable demonstration of the impossibility of deriving the Red-Knight-Witch-Uncle plot of *Sp* from *C*.

Griffith's dissertation has been unfavorably reviewed by Windisch, *Das keltische Britannien* (1912), pp. 284 f. (Leipzig, *Abhandlungen*, 29); Golther, *Literaturblatt* (1912), pp. 393–95; and Bruce, *Romanic Review*, IV (1913), 126–30. It has been favorably noticed by Miss Weston, *Romania*, XL (1911), 625–30; *Folk-Lore*, XXIII (1912), 118; Frantzen, *Anglia Beiblatt*, XXIII (1912), 260–67; and Brugger, *Ztsch. für franz. Sprache u. Litt.*, XLIV (1917), 137–86.

Brugger's review of Griffith shows that *Sp* resembles stories of the Helpful Companion (*kunstreiche-Brüder*) type. Brugger's examples belong rather, I think, to the type of the Fated Prince, who gets magic weapons or talismans from his mother. Since Brugger announces a paper on the Red-Knight-Witch-Uncle theme, I purposely refrain from discussing folk-tale parallels here.

[3] Sommer, *Vulgate Version*, etc., VII (1913); "Livre d'Artus, MS 337." Miss Weston referred to this as "Merlin, Bib. Nat MS. 337." See *Romania*, XL (1911), 627.

Queen of Denmark (p. 170). Her abode is called "li Chastiaus des Puceles" (319). She brought an enchantment, a cry that drove mad (164, 43) or killed (170, 36) people, and hoped to slay "toz les cheualiers du roiaume de Logres" (318, 34). Only a destined knight (Sagremors, 318) could dispel the enchantment. Gawain finally overthrew Oriols, and the Witch Mother fled.

No one will maintain that this prose story in the *Suite de Merlin* comes from *Sp*, or from the lost French original of *Sp*, nor is it any more possible to derive *Sp* from this prose story. The Red-Knight-Witch-Uncle formula is thus vouched for as existing independently at a later time than Chrétien in a prose romance. The previous discussion, I hope, demonstrates that we must think of it as having existed in French story[1] before the time of *C* and as better preserved in *Sp* than in *C*.

Of course none of the proofs that have been employed to show that *Sp* had a source independent of *C* necessarily demonstrates that *Sp* is uninfluenced by *C*. However, I agree with Griffith (p. 130, n. 2) in detecting no sign of any influence of *C* on *Sp*, and in disbelieving in the "verbal coincidences" which Newell once said[2] that he saw. Griffith's book, which appeared in 1911, practically dared those who did not agree with him to point out these coincidences. No one has done so.

ARTHUR C. L. BROWN

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

[To be continued]

[1] The *vieille*, in Gerbert, referred to above, might well be a surviving fragment from such a lost French *conte*.

[2] W. W. Newell, *The Legend of the Holy Grail* (1902), p. 82, reprinted from *Jour. of American Folk-Lore*, XII (1899), 206. Newell did not specify the "verbal coincidences" but referred to Golther, Munich *Sitzungsberichte*, II (1890), 203 f. If one turns to Golther he is referred to Steinbach, *Über den Einfluss des Crestien de Troies auf die altenglische Literatur* (1885), pp. 27 f., where, of course, many parallels in thought but no "verbal coincidences" are pointed out. A few German scholars by pure assertion seem to have bulldozed the world into believing in "verbal coincidences" between *Sp* and *C*. Probably this confident talk about "verbal" resemblances influenced Professor Schofield, *English Literature to the Norman Conquest*, p. 229, to say, "The author [of *Sp*] may have been influenced by the French *Perceval*."

ON ALLEGED ANGLO-NORMANISMS IN THE OXFORD *ROLAND*

"It is time," remarked W. Tavernier not long ago,[1] "that the language of the Roland-epic were once more thoroughly investigated." This is true; indeed it is surprising how little systematic effort has been made either to study the script of the Bodleian manuscript, or to describe the language of the Oxford version, or to connect its language with that of other Old French monuments—with the *Brendan*, for example, with the Romances of Thebes and of Troy, with Benoît, Wace, and Guillaume de St. Paier, to name only some of the most promising.

This situation may be easily explained but is none the less regrettable, for, as a result, the *Chanson de Roland* has not yet come into its own. The total effect of the multiplied Gautier editions has been, on the whole, prejudicial, for they present the poem enthusiastically in an atmosphere which, in many respects, has proved to be psychologically false. Looking back over the history of the *Roland* as a text, we may ignore for the moment the editions preceding that of the "sage and prudent" Theodor Müller, whose latest text, that of 1878, still remains to some extent a classic. Müller, however, worked in those days with tools immensely inferior to those now at hand. G. Paris followed with his epoch-making "Extracts" (1887 and following); these, unfortunately, covered only one-fifth of the poem, while none of this scholar's precious observations, scattered through *Romania* and other journals and publications, formed a sufficiently connected exposition to warrant their inclusion in the volume of his *Mélanges linguistiques;* only the brief and incomplete article on the *Noms de peuples païens* appears there. As for L. Gautier, he was quite unprepared to deal with the fundamental linguistic problems of the *Roland*, and it is one of the ironies of fate that he should have wasted sumptuous pages in unnecessary comment upon very trivial matters of flexion while the great need was

[1] *Zeitschr. für frz. Spr. und Litt.*, XXXVII (1911), 105.

for better explanation of the content—the allusions, the social usages, the structure and unity of the poem, the chivalric and clerical elements, and so on—for some of these matters Gautier was well qualified to throw light upon. The second volume of Stengel's text (the first was of 1900) has unfortunately not yet appeared, unfortunately because, whatever we may think of what Luquiens calls a β-stemma text, the veteran publisher of the first facsimile and of the first diplomatic reprint of the Bodleian manuscript must surely have accumulated, during all these years, a unique and fruitful commentary which ought not now to be lost to the world. Geddes' *Roland* (1906) did not deal with the matter of the language in any of its aspects, nor have Bédier's *Légendes épiques*, so immensely helpful in other ways, aided us at all with the linguistic problem.

Thus it is that Tavernier's statement, quoted above, contains a sober truth.

My present purpose is to examine one of the minor preliminary problems which confront any editor of the text, that of alleged Anglo-Normanisms in the language of the author. This matter is of obvious importance in dealing with the ascription of the *Roland* to Turoldus, ex-bishop of Bayeux, and it has more than one bearing upon the problem of the environment of the epic poet.

It hardly need be stated that I am considering here only those supposed Anglo-Normanisms which, being assured by the assonances, may seem to belong to the author; those due only to the copyist of O (the Oxford manuscript) are easily recognized and may nearly always be eliminated, whether they are the myriad mistakes of flexion or come under the head of rejuvenations.

My point of departure is a remark of Suchier: "Das erhaltene Rolandslied zeigt eine leichte anglonormannische Färbung, die nur zum Teil vom Schreiber der ältesten Handschrift herrührt," and the following comment of G. Paris upon Suchier's statement: "Je ne sais à quoi il [Suchier] reconnaît dans la *Chanson de Roland* 'une légère teinte anglo-normande en dehors de ce qui appartient au copiste du ms. d'Oxford.' "[1] I am come to the conclusion that G. Paris was right in questioning Suchier's opinion, and that all the

[1] Suchier, *Geschichte der französischen Litteratur*, 1900, p. 26; G. Paris, *Journal des Savants*, 1901, p. 653.

alleged cases of non-Continental coloring will disappear under close examination. Of these the most important, those which have attracted the most attention,[1] are: (1) the use of *suer* s o r o r as an oblique case 312 (=294); (2) the use of *empereor* as a nominative case 1444; (3) the appearance of *mercidet* as subjunctive present third (being properly indicative present third) in line 519; and (4) the use of *dous* instead of *dui*, or *doi*, the oblique case instead of the nominative, in line 1440. There may be a few other cases of the same sort, but if these much-debated four can be eliminated the conviction will be overwhelming that the others should disappear also.

The first case—*suer* as an oblique case—is difficult of proof, for or against. In discussing *sa seror* as a nominative case and *prestre* as an oblique case, G. Paris (Ambroise, *Guerre sainte*, p. xl, and Ambroise was a Continental) explains with his usual clearness: "Ici les deux cas étaient trop distincts: on les prit pour des mots différents." Nearer to the time of Turoldus we find in the *Coronement Looïs* 1763:

Ou a trové et evesques et ábes

where the assonance is with *haste*, *corage*, etc. In *Troie*, Constans found as oblique cases *fel*, *ante* a m i t a, *gloz*, and the adjective *maire* m a j o r (VI, 132, 136). In O itself *filz* is the constant form for the oblique case; as to this word, the use of the inflected form as a vocative caused its generalization, and there is no reason why the same fate should not have befallen *suer*. The survival of *suer* into modern French, along with *prestre* and *filz* (we find *Labbe* also, as a proper noun) is an argument not without weight here.

The second case, *emperedor* as a nominative singular 1444 is more interesting. If my emendation is accepted we shall not only restore the correct flexion but may also, in so doing, strengthen the argument which would date the *Roland*, as we have it, at about the year 1108, or, at any rate, during the first decade of the twelfth century.

Lines 1443–44 read, expanding the abbreviations:

Il est escrit en la geste francor
Que vassals est li nostre empereor.

[1] Suchier had raised the question in 1879 (*Reimpredigt*, pp. xl–xli), touching there upon points 3 and 4 only. G. Paris replied at length in *Romania*, XI (1892), 400–409, but Suchier, evidently, was not convinced.

The attempts to escape from this flagrant violation of the flexion—flagrant because O, over and over again, has the correct nominative *emperedre*, assured by the assonance—have been persistent:

Que vassal sunt a nostre emperéur [Böhmer-Müller].
Que bons vassals unt nostre empereür [Gautier].
Que proz vassals i out l'emperëur [Stengel].

Of these readings, Stengel's, taken from V^7, is very awkward ("that there were there valiant heroes of the Emperor"); Gautier's is unsatisfactory (for there was only one Emperor of the Franks in Charlemagne's day); while the Böhmer-Müller line is questionable as to syntax and has no MS support whatever. It is noticeable, however, that all four editors agree in one important respect—they take line 1444 as spoken not in eulogy of Charlemagne but in praise of his men, the Franceis. As T. Müller said, "die Rede ist nur von den Kriegern Karls." In fact, an attentive reading makes it certain that Charles's warriors, and not Charles, are in the Archbishop's mind from the first line of his speech until the last, and in the author's mind throughout, until:

1448 Li reis Marsilies od sa grant ost l o r sort.

Charles appears here only as being fortunate to possess these heroes among his vassals, and we shall do well if we propose a reading which will meet this first and indispensable requirement—the elimination of the ill-timed eulogy of Charles interjected into a *laisse* entirely given over to the praise of the Franks.[1] When, much later, the poet eulogizes Charles:

3579 Molt est vassals Charles de France dolce

and fills the whole of this *laisse* with his doings, it would have been equally out of place had Turoldus interjected there a passage, a sort of aside, complimenting the Franks. I believe, therefore, that the line originally read:

Que vassal sont li nostre emperedor

where *li* is not yet the definite article but still a demonstrative pronoun, precisely as in *los de my Cid:* "That they—the men of—our Emperor (Charles) are heroes."

[1] W. Tavernier, ignoring T. Müller's judicious remark, puts the cart before the horse. He interprets: "1441 ff. Das Lob der Frankenhelden Karls, wohl nicht ohne dass R [the last redactor] dabei mit Stolz an die Franzosen seiner Zeit dacht" (*Vorgeschichte*, 1903, p. 112).

This archaic use of what is now the definite article hardly needs the support of an extensive citation of parallels. One of the oldest is St. Leger 20*d*: *Vindrent parent e lor ami, L i sant Ledgier, l i Evruin.* The construction is found elsewhere in *Roland* (3145 *Por l a Charlon*) and long after the beginning of the twelfth century; cf. *Et l i Fromont ... Cil criënt "Blaivies!"* Jourdain de Blaye 1101; *Onc mais ne fu tel* [gent] *aünée Fors la Cesar e l a Pompée,* Thebes 1990. Even the oblique *l e s* is found used pronominally, where the risk of misunderstanding seems still greater; cf. *Mil chevaliers esliz e buens, Que d e s son pere, que d e s suens,* Troie 7699, also 10779 and 15666 (Constans, VI, 147). Suchier (*Grundriss*[2], p. 808) and Meyer-Lübke (*Grammaire,* III, § 81) both deal with the construction, as does also A. Thomas (*Nouveaux Essais,* p. 32).

Addressing the critics who have thought to detect various contradictions and inconsistencies in the *Roland,* Professor Bédier pertinently inquires: "Sont-ils bien sûrs d'avoir fait d'abord tout le possible pour justifier le poète?" One might fitly question also: Have those who so easily abandon the readings of O done everything in reason to justify the oldest manuscript? The foregoing is a case in point: the copyist, having his eye carelessly upon the line just preceding:

Soz ciel n'at rei plus en ait de meillors

that is, *meillors homes,* and failing to recognize the archaic *li,* wrote down *vassals est* instead of *vassal sont,* thereby spoiling the unity of the *laisse,* and furnishing the semblance of an argument to those who will have it that the poet of the *Roland* was an English Norman, an "Anglo-Norman."

Aside from this, more may depend upon the correctness of this proposed reading of line 1444: for where, in what *Gesta Francorum,* is it written that "Charles' Franks are heroes," or, more precisely, that "our Emperor's men are heroes"?

The words *il est escrit* seem unusually explicit[1]—*scriptum est*—

Il est escrit en la Geste Francor
Que ...

[1] Similarly 3742: *Il est escrit en l'ancienne geste,* where there is no need to despair of finding the original; cf., for example, Einhard, *Vita Caroli,* ch. 30.

Merely thus to capitalize the title is enough to set one to work in the chronicles entitled *Historia Francorum* (for *estoire* and *geste* are never far apart) or, better, in the histories of the first Crusade. It may be stated at once that there is no such praise of the French in the oldest *Gesta Francorum*, that which Hagenmeyer conjectures to have been written by a secretary of the heroic Boamundus, nothing at least which might be the original in case we are dealing here with a verbal citation. We must continue the search, therefore, among the ten or more subsequent *Gesta*—Guibert of Nogent, Baudry of Dol, Robert of Reims, and the others—for there can be little doubt but that the title *Gesta Francorum*, in the early twelfth century, had become a generic term applicable to any history of the *prima expeditio* of 1096. We even find it applied in one manuscript to the *Annals* of Flodoard (ed. Lauer, pp. xlii and l), where it was introduced to replace the correct title *Gesta Normannorum*. But of all these early accounts of the Iter Hierosolymitanum, it is noteworthy that one, judging from the manuscripts known (these reach to over one hundred), was by far the most popular, a popularity due no doubt to its easy and perspicuous style (in great contrast to the rugged Latinity of the original Anonymus), and to certain more or less fictitious embellishments which the imaginative author allowed himself. This, of course, is the *Historia Hierosolymitana* of Robert of Reims; his book may not improperly be described as having been, in the early twelfth century, the Vulgate version of what happened during Pope Urban's Crusade.

It is well known that Tavernier found some striking resemblances between scenes in the *Roland* and passages in Robert's book. In the case of *Roland*, 110 ff. (=Robert, *Rec.*, III, 791) he was of opinion that the two scenes could not have originated independently, but was uncertain as to which of the two was prior. Would it help matters if it should appear that line 1444 of the *Roland* is almost certainly a reminiscence of a passage in Robert's version of Urban's address at the Council of Clermont?

The passage in question, with unimportant omissions, reads:

> ... dicens: "Gens Francorum, gens transmontana, gens, sicuti in pluribus vestris elucet operibus, a Deo electa et dilecta .... ad vos sermo noster dirigitur. .... Quibus igitur .... labor incumbit, nisi vobis, quibus

prae ceteris gentibus contulit Dominus insigne decus armorum, magnitudinem animorum, agilitatem corporum, virtutem humiliandi verticem . . . . vobis resistentium?

"Moveant vos et incitent animos vestros ad virilitatem gesta praedecessorum, probitas et magnitudo Karoli Magni Regis[1] et Ludovici filii sui, aliorumque regum vestrorum. . . . . O fortissimi milites, et invictorum propago parentum, nolite degenerare, sed virtutis priorum vestrorum reminiscimini!"[1]

As an original for the *Roland* passage this seems satisfactory, not only in substance, but verbally: *fortissimi milites* answers pretty closely to *vassals*, supported as it is by *agilitas corporum* and by *magnitudo animorum;* but the chief weight of the argument comes, of course, from the collocation, the coincidence here of the four factors—the Franks, Charles, heroic warriors, a *Geste Francor*—and to diminish the weight of the argument there must be pointed out other *Gesta Francorum* in which the same four factors are all present in intimate association.[2]

It is becoming increasingly certain, therefore, that the *Roland*, as we have it, was written after the *Historia* of Robert of Reims.

But here we are confronted with some unwelcome uncertainty as to the date of Robert's book: Marquardt, in 1892, concluded for the period 1112 to 1118; this was approved by Hagenmeyer, who at the same time mentioned Riant's impression that Robert might be of 1101 or 1102 and hence anterior in date to Guibert and to Baudry. I do not know upon what basis Bédier now states that Robert's book was written "before 1107" and must leave the matter here for the present.[3]

Our third case is *mercidet* (519) instead of *mercit.* Suchier saw in this an Anglo-Normanism, for which he cited two parallels from the *Brendan: cesset* 224 and *neie* necet 1452, both assured by the

[1] Bédier (IV, 456) also quotes this passage from Robert as illustrating the exploitation of the Charlemagne legend about the year 1100.

[2] Thus the interesting passage cited by F. M. Warren from Richer's *Historiarum libri iv*, I, chap. vii, in which Odo, king of the Franks, exhorts his soldiers: "Aliis quoque gentibus eos esse potiores tam viribus quam audatia et armis, memorabat," would furnish only two of the needed elements; cf. *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, XXX (1915), 651.

[3] Marquardt, *Die Hist. Hieros. des Robertus Monachus*, 1892; Hagenmeyer, *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088–1100*, 1901, p. 186, n. 13; Riant, *Epistola Alexii ad Robertum*, 1879, pp. xli and lxi; Bédier, *Les Légendes épiques*, IV, 457, note. I expect to return to the matter in my forthcoming college edition of the Oxford *Roland*.

rhyme. Rambeau (p. 177) had pointed out that the reading is supported by *n* (the Norse translation): "und Gott lohne dir deinen guten Willen." A Franco-Norman, Suchier maintained, would not have used such a form, while G. Paris[1] proposed to correct it to *vertisset*. The line in full is:

Deus, se lui plaist, a bien le vos mercidet!

Examining the form of expression closely, it cannot fail to strike one that the formula *merciër qqch à qqn* is very suspicious; we find rather *merciër qqn de qqch*, as in Crestien's *Erec* 1275, Troie 6452, and a hundred other passages. On the other hand, the expression *Dex le vos mire!* (from *merir*) is quite common, and when we find that *merir*, according to Kirste,[2] is usually inchoative, we shall have no hesitation in reading *merisset*, and in translating, "May it please God to recompense you well for it!" As for *a bien, a mal*, examples will be found in Tobler's *Wörterbuch, s.v.* à, column 18, line 21 ff.

The fourth case involves the couplet 1439–40:

Paien sont mort a milliers e a fols,
De cent milliers nen poedent guarir dous.

Here the argument has been that, *guarir* being intransitive ("to escape") *dous* is employed as a nominative in place of *dui*, or possibly of *doi*, on account of the assonance. But it is far from clear that *guarir* is necessarily intransitive; it is also a transitive verb in the *Roland* (21, 1241, 3828); *Or pensons deu remenant garir* writes Villehardouin (§ 364). Nothing prevents us from understanding *guarir* as "to save," or from continuing *païen* as the subject of the second verb.

The fact appears to be that one could make out a much better case for Picardisms in the original *Chanson de Roland* than for Anglo-Normanisms. To cite two of the more obvious cases, here is *chadir*, assured by the assonance 2034, in spite of *chadeir* assured three times in assonance; there is also *mel* m a l u m 2006 which seems to belong

[1] *Romania*, XI, 401; XV, 141. G. Paris, as I perceived after convincing myself that *merir* and not *merciër* was the verb used by the poet, had also considered *merisset*, but wrongly, as I believe, rejected it in favor of *vertisset*.

[2] *Historische Untersuchung über den Conjunctiv Praes. im Altfranzösischen*, 1890, p. 88. Two instances may suffice: "Si vos pri se vos avez ceste grace et je la vos puis aidier a porchacier, que vos le merissoiz moi et mon fil." Prose *Merlin*, in Constans, *Chrestomathie*[3], p. 84, col. 2. *Aiol* 3510: Dameldex, se li plaist, il li merisse! (noted by G. Paris); cf. 2182, and Foerster's note.

to (or to have lasted longer in) the Picard region. While it is true that the natives spoke a partly Picard dialect at Envermeu and at Mont St. Michel, in the early twelfth century, we have long ago learned not to attach too much importance to the appearance of these double forms in a long poem. As Långfors has said recently (*Romania*, XLIV, 137) they prove little or nothing as to the home of an author; and we must admit, as P. Meyer wrote in 1884, that the poets took the liberty of assonancing in the same composition forms which belonged to distinctly different territories.[1] But Picardisms assured for the author of the *Roland* do not argue that he was an English Norman; quite the contrary.

T. ATKINSON JENKINS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[1] *Girart de Roussillon: Chanson de Geste*, Introduction, pp. clxxxiv–v.

FORMAS REGRESIVAS ESPAÑOLAS

En *Revista de Filología Española* (IV, 205) propuse una forma latina *p o p u s para explicar el castellano *pobo* 'chopo' que por su difusión y arraigo, hasta en la toponimia, no parecía una importación y que por su forma especial no correspondía tampoco a un origen p o p u l u s. Como el tema merece ser confirmado y ampliado, expongo ahora unos pocos ejemplos, eligiendo solo aquellos que por su absoluta semejanza con p o p u l u s *p o p u s pueden concretar bien el problema. La importancia de este proceso regresivo no es de creer que sea grande por el número, pero el avance de las etimologías castellanas nos anuncia que no han de faltar las sorpresas. El cuadro de regresiones tropieza aún con una dificultad previa en algunos casos, y es el determinar si el acortamiento ha sido latino o se ha cumplido posteriormente. El segundo caso es en algunos de los ejemplos evidente; así en r o s m a r i n u s no se logra ver una forma hábil para explicar el moderno *romero*, y tenemos que pensar en una forma castellana **romerino;* así creo yo que el vasco *ira* 'helecho' no puede ser sino una regresión del latinismo vasco *iratze* f i l i c t u (comp. f i l u *iru*). Pero los ejemplos en que la determinación es difícil son mas abundantes. El aragonés, junto a las formas comunes *fraxno* y *frexno* del f r a x i n u s, conoce la variante *freja* en Miralbueno (Zaragoza), que lo mismo puede ser una regresión de una forma romance **fréjano* que derivación directa de un tipo latino *f r a x u s. El castellano *tojo*, que con las mayores probabilidades se corresponde con el t o x i c u m de Plinio (*N.H.*, 26, 74) creo que arranca de una base *t o x u, pero no sería imposible que la formación hubiese tenido lugar posteriormente sobre un castellano **tóxego>toxo.* Los ejemplos análogos a *p o p u s no ofrecen esta dificultad, porque la evolución de las consonantes en período posterior al latín hubiese hecho imposible la regresión, como veremos en cada caso. Todos ellos son diminutivos reales o falsos y la base ideológica de la regresión fué la tendencia a reconstruir el supuesto primitivo. La confirmación de mi hipótesis confirmará a la vez un

hecho puesto en duda, y es la persistencia tardía en el latín vulgar español de diminutivos en-ulus; se entiende no de la existencia material, que es evidente (rotula *rolda*), sino de la conciencia de su significación sin la cual una regresión colectiva resultaría inexplicable. El fenómeno es aplicable a otras regiones románicas y será preciso catalogar en ellas por lo menos las regresiones que constituyan un grupo como las de los diminutivos. En este artículo no he de estudiar estas formas extrañas, pero sí, antes de citar las españolas, evocaremos aquí para comparar con las nuestras alguna de ellas, como *cinga* del rumano, que reclama **cinga* cingula, *iša* del sardo, que debe referirse acaso a **insa* insula, y las formas dialectales italianas *prigo* y *privu*, que suponen mejor *pericum que periculum, y el italiano *baccano*, que reclama *bacchanum por bacchanale. Ante todo es preciso enriquecer este cuadro de regresiones con nuevas formas dialectales, sobre todo de forma diminutiva, estudiadas como es lógico a la luz de leyes fonéticas particulares; ellas han de decidir si formas como las de Montferrat *baju>badzo, ebo, *rodo>roo* proceden respectivamente de bajulus, ebulus, rotulus en virtud de una apócope silábica, como pretende Meyer-Lübke (*Gram.*, I, 339) o son derivados directos de *bajus, *ebus *rotus. Por este retroceso justificaremos algunas formas latinas históricas; ya Walde (*Lat. Wört., s.v.*) ha expuesto como furca es un acortamiento de furcula (ĝhṛtla) con confusión de -cula instrumental con-ula diminutivo; así la forma mantum de San Isidoro (*Etym.*, XIX, 24, 15) origen del español *manto*, es a mi juicio un falso primitivo deducido por intermedio de mantellum de mantele, que, como su gemelo manutergium, significó primero el paño de manos y es un compuesto man-tergsli del verbo *tergeo* 'limpiar.' El retroceso de diminutivos a primitivos de hecho debió alcanzar proporciones mayores, pero solo se nos acusa en regresiones incongruentes cuando se trata de supuestos diminutivos, o cuando, siendo verdaderos, ha habido error al acortar -ulus en un ejemplo de -culus. Los retrocesos en que el primitivo nuevo coincide con un antiguo primitivo no son por lo general fonéticamente determinables; por ejemplo, todos los indicios que poseemos son de que no quedó el primitivo thymum o tumúm en el latín español, sino el diminutivo tumellum, como base del

castellano *tomillo* y gallego *tomelo;* al hallarnos con una forma aislada *tumo*, aplicado al espliego en Alava (Baraibar, *Vocabulario de palabras usadas en Alava, s.v.*) debemos acaso deducir por su(*u*), que no es original de (*ŭ*) latina, sino que es una regresión coincidente de un diminutivo *tumillo*[1] forma vulgar del castellano del norte; pero sin este indicio de la vocal una forma nueva *tomo* nos haría pensar en un t u m u m original. Véanse ahora los ejemplos que propongo de acortamiento de -u l u s .

*P o p u s (p o p u l u s). Propuse esta forma porque en ninguno de los estados de una forma romance que fuese derivada de p o p u l u s podíamos justificar la reducción; en un supuesto *poblo* (compárese p ŏ p u l u *pueblo*), que hubiese durado aún desde un período algo anterior al de la aparición del castellano escrito la reducción sería fonéticamente inexplicable; en un estado **póbolo*, anterior al acortamiento, era posible fonéticamente, pero perdida para entonces la conciencia de su carácter diminutivo la reducción material no es probable. Entonces no cité formas antiguas del *pobo* castellano, pero estas formas existen.

*S c o p u s s c o p u l u s. En Asturias (y León, según el Diccionario de la Academia) existe la voz *escobio* con los diversos sentidos de 'escollo,[2] cerros que sobresalen en las cordilleras por las rocas puntiagudas que hacen difícil el tránsito, vericueto' (*Vocabulario de las palabras y frases bables*, de Rato de Argüelles). Esta forma debe proceder inmediatamente de un supuesto *escobo* (es un fenómeno demasiado conocido la epéntesis de (*i*) en asturiano y leonés, *ruidio, urnia, sornia, chancia, buriaco,* etc.), que acusaría *s c o p u s.

E b u s (e b u l u s). La voz e b u l u s por un proceso extraño, acaso por una asimilación de terminación dentro del latín que originó e g u l u, ha producido una serie de formas, como *yelgo, yergo* y la chocante forma general *yezgo*. Baraibar (en *Nombres vulgares*

[1] La inflexión de (*o*) ante (*i*) acentuada es frecuente en la provincia de Burgos y Soria; hay casos uniformes como t u b e l l u *tubillo* y *tudillo* 'tobillo' *turida* 'la vaca cubierta por el toro' *gurrillas* 'piedrecitas con que se juega' (*gorrón*); casos en que la vocal es oscura e incierta como *chorizo;* y otros en que parece (*o*) normal, como *novillo, ovillo.*

[2] El castellano *escollo* es dentro de sus leyes inexplicable y contra todo lo esperado; s c o p l u **escocho*, como c a p l a *cacha*, s c o p u l u **escueblo* como p o p u l u *pueblo*, s c o c l u **escojo* o **escuejo* como a c u c l a *aguja*. Creo que debe ser del gallego portugués. Claro que fonéticamente le hallaríamos una base en s c u l l a (S c y l l a, escrito s c i l l a e en Maigne d' Arnis: "Saxa latentia in mari"), pero se oponen las otras formas románicas.

de animales y plantas usadas en Alava, 22), cita *yebo*, y esta forma es la que induce a pensar que un doblete *ebus debió producirse del falso diminutivo ebulu. Para él portugués *engo* me faltan datos históricos, y no puedo deducir si su antecedente ha sido **elgo* o **egoo* de egulu, o bien **ego* de *egu.

*Muscus (musculus). Garrote (*El dialecto vulgar leonés*, *s.v.*) presenta la palabra *muscos*: "Los muslos, las ancas de los animales: probablemente es síncopa de *músculos*." El castellano *muslo*, como forma única, bastaría para demostrar que fué musculus y no musclus el introducido en España (comp. masclus del *App. Probi*, *macho* y masculus *maslo*). Así fué posible la reducción *muscus, que acusa el leonés. El gallego *murlo* y *mulro* (de ninguno de estos modos consta en los diccionarios) supone un nuevo tipo de diminutivo *murulu de mus, muris.

*Furuncus (furunculus). La reducción parece haber sido común al latín de otras provincias, furunculu *furuncu, por retroceso lógico de truncu trunculu. El sardo *furuncu* parece un ejemplo de ella. El español lo conoce en sus dialectos. La forma gallega *furuncho* acusa la antigüedad latina y se refiere no a él sino al diminutivo; pero el aragonés *floronco* (*Colección de voces usadas en la Litera*, de Coll) parece ser una desviación de **foronco* *furuncu contaminado con *flor*.

*Betus (betula). Para explicar el gallego y portugués *bido* se había ya pensado en una forma *betus como regresión de betula (cf. Carolina Michaelis, *Frag. Etym.*, 51, y Körting, 1315). No puede olvidarse que en este grupo lingüístico hay que pensar en una posible reducción de vocales (*perigoo perigo*, *poboo pobo*) y que si *biduo* es el representante de *bidoo* betulu, puede ser *bido* un divergente, del intermedio *bidoo*. Creo sin embargo que *bido* no procede de betulu, sino de un *betus latino que ha existido como variante del beta del *Corpus Glossariorum*, V, 347 ("Beta berc arbor dicitur"); pero surge una grave cuestión que es averiguar si beta es una regresión del betula, de Plinio (*N.H.*, XVI, 75) o una importación directa de una forma céltica, de la cual se hubiese derivado el diminutivo betula. Del mismo modo carecen de consistencia las apreciaciones que hagamos sobre el castellano *abedul*, que no se refiere a betula **belda* (cf. *espalda*), ni a betulla **bedolla* (cf. *cebolla*),

haciéndonos pensar en un intermedio lingüístico o en una base distinta *betulis, etc.

*Vincum (vinculum). Esta forma regresiva ha sido ya propuesta por D'Ovidio (*Archivio Glottologico*, XIII, 417) para el gallego portugués *vinco*. Los significados actuales son concretos en gallego, aunque alrededor de la idea de anillo, como *vinca* 'cuello o garganta de alguna vasija, como taza, ollas etc.'; *vinco* 'el triángulo que acompaña a algunas músicas' (*Diccionario gallego-castellano* de Valladares, *s.v.*) 'anilla que se pone en el morro a algunos animales.' El reparo posible puesto a *bido* es aplicable también a este ejemplo. Pero aquí hay un dato positivo que parece confirmar definitivamente el carácter de regresión de *vinco*. En las *Cántigas de Santa María*, en que hallamos aún el estado (*oo*) de -ulu (*perigoo*, 373) hallamos *vinco*, (con *qu* como en otros casos de sinalefa en que queda (*c*) descubierta, como "con hũa branqu' escudela," 92) en la cántiga 369, 12:

O alcayde mui sannudo
disse que o non faría;
mas que lle dess' a sortella
de que o uinqu' era d' ouro,

en que designa 'el aro de una sortija,' y no la sortija con su pedrería, que en la misma cántiga se designa por *anel* y *sortella*.

*Incredus (incredulus). Por una razón análoga a la expuesta en el caso anterior, esto es, por persistir en la lengua de las *Cántigas* aún el estado general (oo), es por lo que puede pensarse que el *encreu: seu* de la 397 (*encreo* en Viterbo) pueda referirse a una forma acortada. El *encrenque* 'incrédulo' del gallego moderno parece un caso de etimología popular, pero no de las formas estudiadas sino de incredente.

*Bacum (baculum). El latín español no parece haber conocido el vulgar baclus, sino el culto baculum *blago*, ya anticuado, y el diminutivo bacellum *bacillo* en Castilla y León, *bacelo*, en Galicia. Pero en el latín occidental el portugués *bago*, sin indicios de una forma *bagoo*, exige un falso primitivo *bacum, que se halla a su vez apoyado por la forma dialectal italiana *bac* (*v.* Körting 1145). Aún es posible que esta lista pudiese ampliarse con algún otro ejemplo; el castellano *berra* y *berro* tendría explicación

obvia reduciéndolo a un primitivo *b e r a por b e r u l a, en vez del celta b e r w r propuesto[1] y cuya *rr* tendría la misma explicación que la de v a r u *barro, berrojo, carrillo, cerrar* y tantos ejemplos semejantes; pero dada la oscuridad etimológica de esta palabra (? *i b e r u l a *ἴβηρίς*, celta **berura?*) nada es prudente concluir. De los ejemplos aducidos no abrigo la pretensión de que todos queden confirmados, ya que el hallazgo de nuevas formas y otros motivos pueden invalidar alguno. Sí creo que la regresión de los diminutivos ha producido formas nuevas latinas que han sido base de tipos inexplicados en las lenguas romances.

VICENTE GARCÍA DE DIEGO

ZARAGOZA

[1] Propuesto por Diez, *Wört.*, 432, y admitido por Körting, 1343, y Meyer-Lübke, *Gram.*, I, 20.

VOWEL-BREAKING IN SOUTHERN FRANCE

I

In the early dialects of southern France the developments *è* > *ie* and *ò* > *uo* were caused by contact with a following palatal and by the harmonic influence of a following close vowel (*i* or *u*). The principle of harmonic change has not been fully recognized, and is not clearly distinguished from the action of palatal-contact in many works dealing with Romanic speech-history. Thus Grandgent[1] explains *fēcī* > **fidzi*, *istī* > **ésti* > *ist(i)*, *uīgintī* > **vejénti* > **vinti*, but overlooks the parallel change of *ó* or *ù* to *ú*. Clear cases of the latter kind are *conuc* = Italian *conobbi* and *fust* = Italian *fosti*. Grandgent ignores *conuc* and accounts for *fust* by putting a hardly justifiable *ū* in Latin **fustī* (§ 182). In Hispanic the period of harmonic influence began after the change of *pira* to *péra*, but before *gula* became *góla*.[2] We may reasonably assume similar relations of time for southern France, so that the *ú* in Provençal **fústi* could have come directly from *ù*. If the *i* of *lèi* came from *lui*, it would seem that the influence of *lui* and *lèi* might have produced **lóri* as a variant of **lóro*, giving Provençal **lúri* > *lur* (= Aragonese *lure*) beside the ordinary form *lor*. In the adjectives *duī*, *suī*, *tuī*, two developments were possible. Latin *ŭ* made close *u* when it was stressed and followed by a vowel, but *o* when it was stressless.[3] Thus the relation of Provençal *dui* to *doi* may be parallel with that of *el* < *illum* to *l* < *illum*. If *doi* was restressed while the harmonic principle was active, it must have made *dui*, although *doi* often kept *ó* under the influence of *dos*. It is therefore wrong to put *dui*, as Grandgent does (§ 34), in the same category with *fug*, *junher*, *punh*. Words of the latter kind formed *ú* directly from *ù*, in regions where *j* < *g* and *ñ* < *η* were earlier than the change of *gula* to *góla*.[4] Harmonic change is seen in *cōgitat* > **kójetat*

[1] *Provençal Phonology and Morphology*, § 27 (Boston, 1909).

[2] *Romanic Review*, VIII, 465.

[3] *Modern Language Review*, XII, 194.

[4] *Modern Philology*, XI, 351.

> **kójitat* > **kújidat* > *cuida* (also **kújidat* > **kújdat* > *cuja*);[1] in the re-stressed verb *soi* > *sui*; and in *tu(i)t* < **tótti*, an emphatic derivative of *tōtī*. The **tūctī* assumed by Grandgent (§ 136) is needless and unjustified. *Tōtus* comes from **towetos* through **to(w)otos*, parallel with *lōtus* < **lo(w)otos* < **lowetos;* Italian *tutto* represents the variant **tow(e)tos*, with *e* lost as in **low(e)tos* > *lautus* (adapted to *lauo* < **lowō*), **now(e)dos* > *nūdus*. The normal derivative of **tótti* was kept in France because it marked an important distinction: **tótti lo *véδont*—**tótto lo *véδont*.

According to Grandgent, *è* became *ie* before *tš*, *dž*, and also, at least in some dialects, before *k* or *g* (§ 30); examples are *lieg* (= *lieit*), *mieja*, and *liegon*, *siec*, *siega*. In Spanish the *w* of Latin *kw* and *gw* is generally kept before *a*, but not elsewhere. We can assume a similar retention of *wa*, after *we* and *wi* lost *w*, in pre-literary Provençal: the *ie* of **siegwa* came from harmonic influence, the sound *w* being essentially the same as close *u*. From normal *siega* beside analogic *sega* (based on *segam* and *segatz*), the indicative formed *siec* = *sec*, with analogic *ie*. *Liegon* borrowed *ie* from the derivatives of **legio* > **lèjjo* and *legit* > **lèjet* (or analogic **lèjjet*), where palatal-contact acted as in *media* > **mèjja* > *mieja*. I cannot find any ground for thinking that occlusives produced vowel-breaking in early Provençal. The change of *χ* to the palatal *ξ* caused the closure of *è* in Hispanic **lèχto* > **léξto*;[2] it is unreasonable to assume a different cause for the fractural closure of **lèχto* > **lieξt* in France.

Grandgent ignores the action of vowel-harmony in *ier* < *herī*, *iest* < *es-tū*, *lieume* < *legūmen*, and says that such action is disproved by words like *empèri* and *òli*, "which must have been adopted fairly early." From Spanish *nunqua* and *lengua* it appears that vowel-harmony was active in Hispanic near the time when Rumanian separated from Italian, after *péra* developed from *pìra*, but before the *ù* of *gùla* became *ó*. Vowel-harmony changed *ù* to *ú*, but did not affect a checked *é* in early Hispanic, the difference between *é* and *í*

[1] The sound *j* (= Italian *j* in *aja*) was lost between palatal vowels too early to change stressless *e* to *i* in **déjeto* > **dédo* > *det*. The variant *dit* formed direct *í* < *i*, where *j* < *g* was earlier than *péra* < *pira*. *Lei* and *rei* seem to be analogic forms based on *leis* < *lēx* (bookish ?) and *reis* < *rēx; leg* shows the influence of *dreg; res* < **réjes* < *rēgēs* is normal and produced, perhaps with the help of **ré* < **réje* < *rēgem*, the singular *res* (p. 3 of Appel's reader).

[2] *Modern Language Review*, VIII, 494.

being much greater than that between *ù* and *ú*. Portuguese developed **lẽgwa* with a nasalized free *é*, which was subject to harmonic alteration in accordance with *fēcī>fiz*. If *péra* was generally developed in the third century, we may safely assume harmonic action in the fourth, at least for Hispanic. Provençal *nonca* may be a re-stressed weak form, like *fo* beside Italian *fu<fŭit* and *doas* beside Portuguese *duas<dŭās*. But if we consider *nonca* a normal form, its agreement with *lenga* seems to show the influence of nasality. In early Provençal, checked vowels followed by nasals became strongly nasalized and were not ordinarily subject to harmonic change. Hence **lẽŋgwa* and **nõŋkwa* did not develop like **ésti>ist(i)*. In **vendémmea>vendemia*, the general retention of *é* probably does not imply nasality, but rather the early cessation of harmonic action[1] in accordance with **róvvea>*róvia>roja*. The *i* of *vint<*vejénti* came from harmonic influence combined with assimilation to the preceding *j* (or *i*, if there was an intermediate **viẽnti*).[2] From *tenuis>*tènoes>teuns*, probably a normal development,[3] it appears that *vinc* is an analogic alteration of **vin*=Spanish *vin<uēnī*. Thus harmonic changes may be assumed for the fourth century in southern France. Is there any reason for thinking that words like *empèri* and *òli* must have become popular before the sixth century? The weak *e* of *empèri* does not indicate an early borrowing; it shows merely that the popular form of a common prefix replaced the bookish form *im-*. Among such words Grandgent puts *apostòli*, with *ò* and *p* alike forbidding us to assume popular use much before the fifth century.

Grandgent tells us that in the extreme west the diphthong *ie* failed to develop before *u*, and apparently before palatals; and in § 51 he says: "Latin *i* and *u* remained if they were immediately preceded by an accented vowel." From the evidence found in Italian and Spanish, it seems clear that the endings of *bonus* and *deus* became *-o(s)* in Continental Romanic. It is therefore wrong to say that *u* remained in *deus;* the Provençal development was *deus<*

[1] What I have said about French *vendenge*, in *Modern Philology*, XV, 182, is presumably wrong; in the light of later discoveries, it seems more likely that in the north, as in most of the south, the second change of hiatus-*e* to *i* was too late to produce *i<é*.

[2] Similarly Rumanian has *nume<nōmen* beside *om<homo*, *pom<pōmum*, the double nasal-influence having the same effect as that of a checking nasal in *cùmpăr <comparo*.

[3] *Romania*, XXXIV, 333.

**dèos* < *deus*, with a widespread variant *dieus* formed by harmonic action. It is hard to understand why Grandgent denies breaking for the extreme west. Millardet records, in his *Études de dialectologie landaise* (Toulouse, 1910), the early development *diu* < *dieu*, and various forms of the usual type, as *biel(h)* or *viel(h)*, *miels*, *miey* (beside stressless *mey* < *medium*), *lheyt* < **lieit*, *sieis*. As Grandgent and Millardet ignore the general principle of vowel-harmony, they do not explain properly words like *breu*, *greu*, *leu*. The historic forms were **brèvs* > *breus*, **brèv* > *breu*, **brèvi* > **brievi* > *brieu*, **brèvs* > *breus*, the change of *v* to *u* being too late to produce breaking. The ablative *breuī* may be represented in *en brieu*. After the loss of final *i*, the historic basis of the *ie*-forms was forgotten; and they generally tended to disappear, except as French influence may have encouraged their use in the border-region. In Gascon the *ie* of **lievi* was sometimes extended to the stem of the verb *levar*.

I have shown above that harmonic changes may be assumed for Provençal, as for Hispanic, in the fourth century. From Portuguese *junge*, *tinge*, *cunha*, *tinha*, beside *cegonha*, *ferrenho* < **ferrēneum*, *terrenho* < **terrēneum*, and from Spanish *uñe*, *tiñe*, *cuña*, *tiña*, beside *cigüeña* < **cegóiña* < **cegóñña*, *costeño*, *isleño* (with *—eño* < **—ēneum*, a variant of the suffix represented in Latin *terrēnus*), we know that palatal-contact produced *í* from *ì* and *ú* from *ù* before harmonic changes began in Hispanic. Vowel-harmony changed *ó* to *ú* (Spanish *conuve* = Provençal *conuc*) and *é* to *í* (Spanish *vin*, Portuguese *vim*), so that the derivatives of *cicōnia* and **-ēneum* exclude the possibility of harmonic changes in forms that preceded **kuñña* and **tiñña*. In Provençal likewise we find a few cases of contact-closure earlier than the change of *pìra* to *péra:* such are *camisa* and *dit*, the change of *ì* to *í* being caused by contact with *š* (< *si*) and *j* (< *g*). The Rumanian derivatives of *camĭsia*, with *a* or *ea* for *e* before *a*, as in *pară* < **péra* < *pira*, *s(e)ară* < *sēra*, show that Grandgent is wrong in assuming *ī* in *camisia* (§ 25). Thus the breaking of *è* to a slightly diphthongal sound, which afterward became *ie*, may belong to the second or third century, at least in *ceresea* > *cerie(i)sa* and *pe(i)ius* > *pieis*. Grandgent's assumption of a later period, between the seventh and tenth centuries, is based on two mistaken theories: first, that breaking was caused by *tš* or *dž*, where the real cause was *ξ* or *j;*

and secondly, that breaking was later than the pre-literary use of *tš* and *dž*, which developed to *ts* (later *s*) and *dz* (later *z*) in words like *detz*, *neça*, *preza*. As a slightly palatalized *t* changed *e* to *ie* in early French *amistied* and *deintied*, we might suppose that a palatalized *d* caused breaking in a pre-literary form of French *prise*<**prieidža*. But occlusives did not cause breaking in Provençal, so that Grandgent's argument lacks a valid basis.

Grandgent's treatment of *ò* is like his treatment of *è*, except that he includes *ñ* (rightly) and labial consonants (wrongly) among the sounds that produced *o*-breakings (§ 37). I do not think *"uops"* should be admitted as a genuine Provençal form. Normal *uo* was by analogy extended to **apr(u)opea* from the synonym **apruoξsma*, and afterward *m'apruopi e trop* developed the analogic variant *m'apruopi e truop*. The form *prueva* is a near relative of Mistral's *chin* and *chivau*. Harmonic breaking occurred in **bòvi*>**buovi*>*buou*, *nouī*>*nuou*, **òvi*>*uou;* by analogy the diphthong sometimes replaced the normal *ò* of the singular. A late Latin form **ou* might have gone through **òo* to *uou*, parallel with *meus*<**mèos*<*mieus*, but the other Romanic tongues call for a basis **òvu* or **òvo*, with analogic *v* taken from **òvi* or **òva*. As **òvo* could make only *òu* in Provençal, Mistral's *iòu* must be considered (like *biòu*) the historic plural used for the singular. Further cases of harmonic change are seen in *suegre*<*soc(e)rī* beside *sogre*<*soc(e)rum;* and in *puec*, *vuelc*, which have lost final *i*, beside *poc*, *volc*, which have lost final *e;* perhaps also in *cuebres*, *uebres*, *uefres*, equivalent to Latin forms in *-īs*. In the derivatives of *locus*>**lògos*>**lòχs*>**lòξs*>**luois*, *locum*>*loc*, *locī*>**luodži* (or analogic **luogi*), *locōs*>**luois*, *loca*>*loga*, analogy restored the lost occlusive and extended the use of *uo*. It seems unlikely that *ñ* could have changed *ò* to *uo* without affecting *è* at the same time (as Grandgent assumes). *Venha* is an analogic alteration of **vieña*, attested by Catalan **viña*, later *vinga*, with normal *i* for *ie* as in *mil(l)s*=Provençal *miel(h)s*, *sis*=Provençal *sieis*, *vine*<**vieni*<*uĕnī*. Provençal *engenh* (=Catalan *enginy*) and *genh*, with the perhaps merely graphic variant *gienh*, developed *e* from *ie* after *dž* in accordance with Italian *g(i)elo* and Spanish *mug(i)er*.

From the evidence presented above with regard to Provençal, I conclude that vowel-harmony was active in the fourth or fifth century,

or perhaps in both, and that changes caused by palatals extended through a period of at least two hundred years, beginning in or before the third century. The breaking of *è* probably began earlier than the breaking of *ò*, as the distinctly open quality of *è*<*ĕ* was developed earlier than that of *ò*<*ŏ*. Rumanian regularly has *ié*<*ĕ* and *é*<*ē* in accordance with Spanish, but levels *ó*<*ŏ* and *ó*<*ō* in accordance with Sardic. This difference shows that continental *è* was an earlier development than *ò*. French has *fierge, orge, tierce, force, tiegne, Saissogne*<*Saxŏnia, tin*<**tiein*<**tèñño, loin*<**lóñ*<*lŏnge*,[1] proving that *è* was developed earlier than *ò* in the north; between the two periods palatalized *r* lost its palatal quality, and nasality changed *ò* to *ó*, so that no breaking occurred in *orge, force, Saissogne, *lóñ*. From these forms and from widespread evidence that *é*<*i* was earlier than *ó*<*u*, as in French *correie, fuie*, Provençal *correja, fuja*, Spanish *correa, huya, leño, puño, seños, uña*, it is clear that velar vowels developed distinct openness later than palatal vowels did in Italy and the west. We may therefore say that contact changes of *è* took place mainly in the third and fourth centuries, and those of *ò* in the fourth and fifth centuries.

Grandgent is evidently right in his general idea that breaking arose from a "premature lifting of the tongue under the influence of a following high vowel or a palatal consonant." Millardet quotes Grandgent's theory with disapproval in his *Études* (p. 213): "Il faudrait qu'il y ait eu anticipation partielle (anticipation de la *fermeture*), ce qui est bien invraisemblable." He has overlooked the numerous changes of *ó* to *ú* before close *i*, which illustrate perfectly the "anticipation de la fermeture." In the west we find French *conui*, Provençal *conuc*, Spanish *conuve*, corresponding to Italian *conobbi*. Northern France has *cuide, sui, tuit*, parallel with the southern forms mentioned above; and *pun*<**púmi*<*pōmī*, beside *pome*<*pōma*. In Hispanic, where harmonic action continued much longer than in Provençal, **róvveo* made **róvio*>*ruvio*, in accord with **vendémmea*>**vendémia*>*vendimia*. Corresponding to Provençal *puec* and *poc*, Portuguese has *pude*<*potuī, pôde*<*potuit, pus*<*posuī, pôs*<*posuit*. Many Italian dialects show developments of the type

[1] I find *Saxonia* given with close *o* in the grammar of Schwan and Behrens, but *Saisnes*<*Saxones* calls for a short *o*. The normality of *tiegne* is indicated by *Compiegne*, and that of *tin* by *engin*.

-úsi < *-ōsī* beside *-ósa* < *-ōsa*, and Tuscan *lupo* was taken from a dialect having normal *lupi* < *lupī*. The Emilian of Bologna has *fûren, fjûr, lûv*, as the normal plurals of *fåuren* = *forno, fjåur* = *fiore, låuv* < *lupus*, according to Gaudenzi's *Dialetto di Bologna*, p. 72 (Torino, 1889). Portuguese has changed *é* to *í* before *u* in *ésto* > *éstu* > *ištu, éso* > *ésu* > *isu* (written *esto, isto, esso, isso*), and Menéndez Pidal gives similar Asturian forms in his *Gramática española*, p. 35 (Madrid, 1905), as *puirtu* beside *puerta*, parallel with *isti utru* beside *esta otra*. Stressless vowels sometimes show harmonic closure in Spanish (*equal* > *igual*) and Italian (*polire* > *pulire*). In central and southern Italy harmonic breaking is common, as *buoni* beside *bona;* the *buono* of such dialects may be analogic, though it is commonly held to indicate *u*-influence, in accord with southern Sardic *bónu* beside *bònus* < *bonōs, dòmu* < *domō*.

Ignoring the principle of vowel-harmony, Millardet constructs a remarkable theory: in groups like *èi, èu, òi, òu*, the first element, being opener than the second, could have undergone a fractural opening by dissimilation; and a further dissimilation could have made the first portion of the fractured vowel closer, until it became *i* or *u*. Thus if Grandgent's theory is weak (as Millardet assumes), Millardet's theory must be equally weak, for both rest on the same basis, namely the openness of *è* and *ò* with regard to the sounds that caused breaking. If one of the theories is right, we must choose between assimilation and dissimilation with regard to closeness. Leaving aside fractural changes, we find that palatal-contact regularly produced closer sounds in early Hispanic: **tìñña* > *tiña, *sèχs* > **sèξs* > **séξs* > *seis, *faχta* > **faξta* > **fèξta* > **féξta, *fòλλa* > **fóλλa, ŭngula* > *uña*. It is therefore only reasonable to hold that the fractural changes of Aragonese and Asturian, such as *nueite* or *nueche* beside *noite* = *noche* < **nóξte* < **nòξte*, began with closure (partial assimilation) rather than with the contrary development (dissimilation). The action of vowel-harmony and of palatal-contact as found in Spain and Portugal agrees with what is found in Italy and France. Hence the evidence is against Millardet's theory. The weakness of Millardet's objection, with regard to anticipation, is shown by the harmonic breaking of *é* and *ó* in Rumanian: *moară* < *mola, soare* < *sōlem, toată* > *tōta, toate* < *tōtae, tot(u)* < *tōtus, vază* < **véadza* < *uideat, vede* < **véade* > *uidet, vedeà* < *uidēre, vedere* < **vedéare* < *uidēre*. Corresponding to

è<*ĕ* and *ó*<*ŏ*, stressless *e* was open while stressless *o* was close (afterward becoming *u*) in early Rumanian. Thus weak *e* had the same opening effect as *a*, while *o* did not produce breaking: *coc*< *coquo*, *negru*<**négro*<*nigrum*, *văz*<**védzo*<*uideo*.

II

The diphthong *iu* was widely changed to *ieu* in early Provençal. To understand the development we must consider the tongue-positions of various vowels. In the following diagrams *ë* stands for the neutral vowel written *ă* in Rumanian, *e* in English *bakery;* and *ï* is the corresponding closer sound written *y* in Polish, *î* in Rumanian.

The first diagram has the form usually adopted for convenience in printing. It treats the curved palatal section as a straight line, and may be compared with the earth's surface represented in rectangular projection, making Alaska look about as big as Brazil. The real tongue-positions are more like those shown in the second diagram. In going directly from *i* to *u*, the tongue must move through the *ë*-position. A slight delay in forming the movement will cause the *ë* to be heard separately: thus *iu* became *iëu*. In such groups there is a general tendency to stress the opener sound, *ie* having become *iè* or *ié* in many Romanic languages. As Provençal had no stressed *ë*, stressed *iëu* became *ieu* when *e* was stressed in *ieu*<*èu*. The change of stressless *iëu* to *ieu* may be compared with that of *ë* to *e* in *entre*<*intro*, *mascle*<*masculum*, *senher*<*senior*. Some of the modern dialects have *iàu* for *ieu* (*fiau*=*fiéu*<*fil*). It is possible that *ë* changed directly to *a;* but it seems more likely that *e* became *a* before *u*, as in *dau laugier*<*del leugier*. The *o* of *miòu*<*mul* was developed from *ë* before the derivative of *ū* lost its labial quality. In such forms as *fial*, *fiel*, *muol*, the breaking seems to be connected with the *u*-like quality of final *l*.

In the modern dialect of southern Provence, we find *-ien* where Mistral writes *-ioun*, as *benedicien*, *eleicien*, *empousicien*.[1] This

[1] *Armana prouvençau*, 1910, p. 36.

indicates a development of *iú* to *iéu;* after the stress was displaced, *un* changed through nasalized *u* to the velar nasal *ŋ*. The latter change may be compared with the Galician formation of *n* from nasalized *w*, in *ūna*>*ũa*>**ũ̃wa*>*uŋa* (written *unha*).

III

A few words have *ai* in the place of earlier *a: aic, aiga, aigla.* Grandgent assumes that the first consonant of *aqua* and *aquila* became *χ*, "which later changed to *i*" (§ 72).[1] If we suppose that Germanic **aχwa* replaced *aqua*, and that for some reason *aquila* underwent a similar change, the theory gains little in value, for Germanic *χ* and *h* made *k* or disappeared: **jeχ-*> *geq-, fehu*>*fieu.* And even supposing that unexplained **aχwa* and **aχwila* or **aχwela* were too early or too late to be treated as Germanic-like forms, the velar-velar group *χw* could only make *w* or *gw* or *kw*, or perhaps *v* or *f*. The *χ* of *χs* and *χt* was palatalized by partial assimilation to the following sounds, but a *χ* before *w* could have made *i* only after a distinctly palatal vowel (*i* or *e*). Thus the **aχwa*-theory is almost baseless and entirely worthless. Provençal *aiga*, taken by itself, might be connected with Germanic **aγwia* (Scandin*auia*, Icelandic *ā*, Swedish *å*, German *ouwa*>*ouwe*>*aue*); but Corsican *èkkwa* shows that it came from Romanic **akwia.*[2] Contrary to *laça*<**laqueat, *akwia* kept *w* under the influence of *aqua.* In **akwela*>**akela*, the *e* was sometimes lost in accord with older *altra;* but as words of the *altera*-form had generally disappeared, another development became widespread: **aekla*>*aigla* (whence French *aigle* for native **eaule*). Stressed *habuī*>*aic* was normal, corresponding to the harmonic change of *è, ò, é, ó*, to partially or totally closer vowels; *ac ieu* is analogic, or shows the regular stressless derivative of **agwi.* Thus in *aic, aigla, aig(u)a*, we do not have ordinary breakings, but displacements like that of *saup*<**saopi*<**sapoi.* The results, however, are formally similar to breakings, and may therefore be considered in connection with them.

EDWIN H. TUTTLE

NORTH HAVEN, CONN.

[1] Grandgent adds, in parentheses, *acqua* and **acquila* as possible sources of imaginary **aχwa* and **aχwila.* Where simple *k* produced an occlusive, it is clear that a prolonged *k* would be treated likewise, aside from the lack of voicing (*secar*).

[2] *Archiv*, CXXXIII, 174.

HUGUES SALEL, POET AND TRANSLATOR

One of the French poets of the first half of the sixteenth century who deserves an intensive study, but who has been neglected, is Hugues Salel, best known as the translator of the *Iliad*. It is the purpose of this article to show to what an extent Salel was appreciated by his century and later by historians of French literature.[1]

I

BRIEF BIOGRAPHY

Hugues Salel was a compatriot of Clément Marot, Eustorg de Beaulieu, and Olivier de Magny. He was born, according to the Abbé Goujet, toward the end of 1504, in Casals, Quercy, in Périgord (Cahors). He is therefore, like several of the poets of the first half of the century, a man of the South.[2] Salel began writing verse at a very early age. At the order of the king, Francis I, he undertook a translation of the *Iliad*. As a reward he was made "valet de chambre" of the King, and in 1540 we find him as the first "abbé commendataire" of the abbey of Saint-Chéron of the diocese of Chartres. From letters of the King, dated from Fontainebleau in 1544 (January 18), we learn of the permission granted to Salel to publish his translation of the *Iliad*, but that order was surely of an earlier date, for in the same letters the King says that the translation of the first nine books had already been presented to him.[3] In the translation Salel has the title of "l'un des Grands Maîtres d'hôtel du Roi." The King bestowed other favors upon the poet, for we read in the *Catalogue des actes de François I^er^:* "Don à Hugues Salel, abbé de Saint-Chéron, du doyenné électif de l'église collégiale de Burlate, diocèse de Castres, vacant par la mort de Folcon Auranc Corbeil, 17 juin, 1546."[4]

[1] An article in Colletet's *Vies* and a pamphlet of little value by Ch. Calmeilles, *Les poètes Quercinois au xvi^e^ siècle: Hugues Salel* (Tours, 1899, 8vo, 29 pp.) and the article "Salel" by the Abbé Goujet, are the only serious attempts at a biographical study of Salel. The author of this article is preparing a monograph on Salel, which will be completed as soon as the European situation will permit.

[2] Goujet, *Bibliothèque historique*, XII, 1 ff.

[3] Goujet, *op. cit.*, IV, 9.

[4] Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, November, 1887, Vol. V, p. 90; No. 15132.

Among Salel's friends was Jean de Boyssonné, the celebrated humanist of Toulouse. From a letter of Boyssonné to Salel we learn that the latter was under the patronage of Bertrand, president of the parliament of Toulouse. He served his patron in the capacity of secretary, and accompanied him on his rounds. In the letter, which refers to some literary matters which will be treated later, Boyssonné says: "Tu omnia boni consules, et gratiam qua apud Praesidem Bertrandum patronum tuum vales. . . . ."[1] And in another letter, written by Boyssonné to Guillaume Scève, he again refers to the same Bertrand.[2] It is from a dixain that we learn that Salel was secretary to Bertrand and went with him on professional journeys. Boyssonné says of Salel's departure:

Il est donc faict, Salel, que tu nous laisses
Pour t'en aller avecq le Président,
Mais tu ne scais combien de cueurs tu blesses
De tes amys marriz de l'accident,
Lesquels vouldroient que tu feusses resident
Sans te partir jamais de ce quartier.[3]

Joachim du Bellay tells of the relations between Salel and Bertrand in one of the *Regrets:*

Entre tous les honneurs, dont en France est cognu
Ce renommé Bertran, des moindres n'est celuy
Que luy donna la Muse, et qu'on dise de luy
Que par luy un Salel soit riche devenu. . . .
Fay que de ta grandeur ton Magny se resente,
A fin que si Bertran de son Salel se vante,
Tu te puisses aussi de ton Magny vanter.
Tous deux sont Quercinois, tous deux bas de stature:
Et ne seroient pas moins semblables d'escriture
Si Salel auoit sceu plus doulcement chanter.[4]

From this poem we learn of Bertrand's generosity to Salel, and we learn in it that Salel was of short stature. The Magny referred to is of course Olivier de Magny.

[1] Buche, "Lettres inédites de J. de Boyssonné," *Revue des langues romanes* (1896), p. 367, No. 31.

[2] Buche, *op. cit.* (1894), p. 328, letter dated "Tholosae xi Calen. Jul. M. D. xxxvii."

[3] Dixains, I *Centurie*, fol. 18 *r.*, MS 836, Bibl. de Toulouse. Cf. Buche, *op. cit.* (1896), p. 141. Cf. also Mugnier, *Jean de Boyssonné*, p. 353.

[4] *Regrets*, CLII, ed. Marty-Laveaux, Vol. II, p. 243.

Clément Marot seems to have been on very intimate terms with the Abbé of Saint-Chéron. Guiffrey mentions a visit which the latter paid to Saint-Chéron upon the invitation of Salel.[1] An interesting anecdote is told of this visit of Marot to his compatriot, which throws light on Marot's skepticism and on Salel's piety. Its authenticity, however, is not guaranteed. The story goes as follows:

Il existe dans l'abbaye de Saint-Chéron, près Chartres, une fontaine miraculeuse appelée fontaine de Saint-Mesme. Lorsque les fêtes de Saint-Chéron ou de Sainte-Mesme approchent, elle déborde de tous côtés. Et lorsque les eaux sont les plus grandes (ailleurs), elle est presque tarie. Ceux qui en boivent sont guéris de la fièvre. Hugues Salel, abbé de Saint-Chéron, ayant amené Clément Marot en son abbaye le jour de la fête de Saint-Chéron, lui qui ne croyait guère aux miracles, voulut éprouver celui de la fontaine. Il veilla toute la nuit dans la grotte et en sortit tout épouvanté, tant par les visions étranges qu'il y eut la nuit que par la crue de l'eau qui s'y éleva en plus grande abondance que peut-être elle n'avoit jamais fait auparavant. Ce qui ayant été rapporté par Marot à l'abbé Salel, il lui remontra qu'il n'avoit pas eu raison de tenter Dieu en une chose qu'on avoit reconnue de toute ancienneté.[2]

Marot refers to Salel in an epigram which is very often cited, as it enumerates many of the poets of the period. In the concluding lines we read:

> Quercy, Salel, de toy se vantera,
> Et (comme croy) de moy ne se taira.[3]

In a poem, "Sur la devise de Hugues Salel, valet de chambre du Roy François I," Marot expresses his esteem and admiration for his fellow-poet:

> Honneur te guide et te met en haultesse,
> Pour ton grand sens et ta science acquise, . . .
> Tu t'es conduit par très grande sagesse;
> Merveille n'est si donc en ceste guyse
> Honneur te guide.[4]

[1] Guiffrey, *Œuvres de Clément Marot*, I, 478 ff.

[2] *Bibl. de la ville de Chartres, Janvier de Flainville*, portef. I, p. 198. Cf. Guiffrey, *op. cit.*, p. 479. Ch. d'Héricault, in the preface to his edition of Marot's selected works, tells the same anecdote, but he confuses the dates concerning Salel, and, besides, the story as told by Héricault, citing local traditions of Chartres, makes it seem that the miracle took place for Marot's special benefit.

[3] Marot, Epigram clxxv, *Des Poètes françois à Salel*, ed. Lemerre, Paris, 1873, Vol. III, p. 71.

[4] Marot, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 171.

After the death of Francis I in March, 1547, Salel retired finally to Saint-Chéron, and died there after a long illness, in 1553, at the age of forty-nine years. Of the last years of Salel and of his death we read in an epitaph by his friend Pierre Paschal:

D.O.M.S.

Hugoni Salellio, Cadurco, Francisci Gallorum Regis Poetae, vita integerrimo, qui tranquillioris vitae desiderio, ex Regia, mortuo Francisco, ut se totum otio et doctrinae dederet, Carnutum venit, ubi aliquot post annos diuturno et mortifero morbo affectus, de vita humane conditionis memor placide et constanter decessit. Huic hîc quiescenti, et dissoluti corporis renovationem expectanti Petrus Paschalius amicus dolens P. et sub ascia D. Anno a salute mortalibus restituta 1553. vixit ann. 49. Mens. sex.[1]

Ronsard also wrote an epitaph to Hugues Salel, whom he admired greatly. He laments that the poet died in the prime of life. He envies Salel because he won the favor of the King and therefore had the advantage of dying rich, while he, Ronsard, is unappreciated:

Et moi chetif, je vy! et je traine ma vie
Entre mille douleurs, ...
Ah! France, ingrate France, hé! faut-il recevoir
Tant de derisions pour faire son devoir![2]

The following epitaph by Jodelle was engraved on Salel's tombstone:

A LA MÉMOIRE (DE SALEL)

Quercy m'a engendré, les neuf Sœurs m'ont appris,
Les Rois m'ont enrichy, Homere m'eternise,
La Parque maintenant le corps mortel a pris,
Ma vertu dans les cieux l'ame immortelle a mise,
Donc ma seule vertu m'a plus de vie acquise,
Plus de deuin scauoir, plus de richesse aussi
Et plus d'éternité que n'ont pas faict icy
Quercy, les Sœurs, les Roys, l'Iliade entreprise.[3]

Among the titles held by Salel was that of "Conseiller et Aumosnier ordinaire de la Royne." It is from his friend Olivier de Magny that we draw this information.[4]

[1] Cf. Nicéron, *Mémoires*, XXXVI (1736), 166–67.

[2] Ed. Marty-Laveaux, Vol. VI, pp. 247 ff.

[3] Jodelle, *Œuvres* (ed. Marty-Laveaux, 1870), p. 374.

[4] *Les amours d'Olivier de Magny*, Lyon, Rigaud, 1572, 16mo, f. P.A. 2 *v.*, Bibl. Nat., Rés. 4578A.

From Ronsard too we learn that Salel received favors from "Monsieur du Thier, secrétaire d'état." In a poem addressed to the latter Ronsard says:

> Du Thier, tu es heureux, qui as eu le pouuoir
> De faire heureux autruy: tu le fis bien sçauoir
> A Salel. . . .
> Tu fis Salel heureux, et tu peux faire heureux
> Ronsard tant seulement d'une seule parole.[1]

Another of Salel's patrons seems to have been Jean d'Avanson, "seigneur de Saint Marcel, conseiller privé, qui devint plus tard surintendant des finances sous Henri II. Le sire d'Avanson [says Crépet] avait été pour Hugues Salel un patron fidèle et généreux."[2]

II

THE TRANSLATION OF THE "ILIAD"

It was at the order of Francis I that Salel undertook to render into French verse the books of the *Iliad*. It seems that the translation of the first nine books was very poorly printed, for the King complains that it appeared with many grave mistakes: "avec une infinité de fautes et de changemens de diction, qui altéroient le sens des sentences, contre l'intention de l'Auteur, et la diligence du translateur . . . au préjudice de l'utilité, richesse, et décoration que notre langue recevoit de cette traduction, dont la lecture nous a été si agréable, et nous a tant delecté, que nous désirons singulièrement les continuation et parachevement de l'œuvre."[3]

This edition, Goujet tells us, was made in Lyons, but he adds that he has not been able to discover in what year. Salel, fearing that the mistakes would be attributed to him, hurried to have the first ten books printed under his own supervision, for the first edition was a pirated one. This second edition appeared in 1545, from the press of Sertenas, in Paris (folio). Lintilhac, in his *Précis historique et critique* (I, 182), says that it is understood that the translation was

[1] Ed. Marty-Laveaux, Vol. VI, p. 264. For Du Thier, cf. also Du Bellay, same edition, II, 200, 244, 291, 292; Ronsard, II, 17, 18; III, 427–38; V, 138–44; VI, 263, 264; App. II, 397.

[2] Cf. Crépet, *Poètes français*, II, 47, notice on Olivier de Magny by Asselineau. D'Avanson became the friend and protector of Magny, who was introduced to the court by Salel.

[3] Abbé Goujet, *op. cit.*, IV, 9, citing the *Lettres patentes* of the King.

made from the Latin of Valla. From a preface to the eleventh and twelfth books, and a fragment of the thirteenth, edited after his death by Olivier de Magny, it seems that Salel was accused of having made use of a Latin version instead of the original Greek. Magny answers the accusation by saying that he was Salel's amanuensis, and that he can with truth bear witness to the contrary.[1] Pellissier, in his introduction to Vauquelin de Fresnaye's *Art poétique*, states that Salel's translation was made from a French version, which in turn was based on the Latin of Laurent Valla.[2]

Salel was able to publish only the first eleven books of the *Iliad;* the translation was continued by Amadis Jamyn. The history of the manuscripts of these first books throws a very interesting light on Salel's relations with the court, as well as on the bibliographical aspect of the situation. In the notes to the manuscript of the first and second books of the *Iliad*, in the catalogue of the Musée Condé (Chantilly), the editor says:[3]

> Il est probable qu'aussitôt après avoir achevé la traduction des deux premiers livres, Salel voulut soumettre son œuvre à l'un des protecteurs les plus puissants qu'il pût rencontrer à la cour. Ce petit volume fut sans doute offert par lui à la sœur de son maître, à Marguerite d'Angoulême. La recherche seule de l'exécution ferait supposer que ce livre était destiné à un grand personnage: les chiffres et les emblêmes dont les plats sont chargés confirment notre supposition.

The manuscript bears a *dedicace* to Francis I (eight lines) preceding the translation of the first book, and another (thirteen lines), before the second book. Another manuscript of the second book (both of the sixteenth century), also bearing the same verses to the King, bears on the fly leaf the signature of Magdalene Levyngstown, one of the Scotch maids of honor of Marie Stuart.[4]

Ronsard was one of the first to express his admiration of Salel as translator of the *Iliad.* Salel, he says, deserves great credit:

> Qui des premiers tira notre langue d'enfance,
> Et de qui le sçavoir avoit bien merité
> D'estre d'un si grand Roy·si doucement traitté.[5]

[1] Cary, *Early French Poets* (London, 1846), pp. 40 ff.

[2] *Art poétique* (Paris, 1885), p. 56. Judgment on this question will be reserved until later. Chamard, in his *Joachim du Bellay* (1900), p. 1, says that Salel knew Greek, having studied with Budé.

[3] *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque du Musée Condé*, No. 945, p. 21.

[4] MS No. 1631 (446). As it was customary to circulate works in manuscript before publishing them, the above-mentioned conjectures seem highly probable.

[5] Ed. Marty-Laveaux, Vol. VI, pp. 247 ff.

Jodelle, in a sonnet, "A Salel," compares the poet to Homer himself:

Salel, vainqueur de ce faucheur chenu
Salel, qui tant par ses vers me peult plaire?
La France ainsi sa plainte voulait faire
Quand son Salel de rechef est venu,
Luy apportant ceste abondante corne,
Dont il repand le beau fruyt qui nous orne,
Fruyt qu'il acouple à ce present fecond,
Qu'au iardin Grec iadis on luy veit prendre,
Lors qu'il se fit un Homere second
Digne du lit de mon grand Alexandre.[1]

Tahureau du Mans is no less extravagant in his praises. In a sonnet, "A Salel trespassé, sur ses XI & XII de l'*Iliade*," when a manuscript was discovered after Salel's death, showing that he had also translated these two books. Tahureau writes:

Mais toy, qui sans mourir seras tousjours vivant,
Te doibs je plaindre? Non, car d'un los revivant
Ton Homere ha gaigné sus ta mort la victoire.[2]

Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, in his *Art poétique*, advises the poets to translate from Latin and Greek, if they can do it as well as Salel and Jamin:

SALEL premier ainsi, du grand François conduit,
Beaucoup de l'*Illiade* a doucement traduit,
Et Iamin bien disant, l'a tellement refaite
Qu'à lautheur ne fait tort un si bon interprète.[3]

The four poems just cited are typical of the high esteem in which Salel's *Iliad* was held by the poets. The early critics and prose writers were on the whole just as liberal in their praises. Sibilet says of Salel, in connection with the *Iliad*, "Imite donc Marot en sa *Metamorphose*, en son *Musee*, en ses *Psalmes:* Salel, en son *Iliade*."[4] Etienne Pasquier, in his *Recherches de la France*, calls Salel the "poète salubre" who "acquit grand nom par sa traduction d'unze livres de l'*Iliade* d'Homere," a translation which he says was "caressee d'un très favorable accueil."[5]

[1] Ed. Marty-Laveaux, Vol. II, p. 337.
[2] Jacques Tahureau du Mans, *Poésies* (ed. Blanchemain, 1870), I, 151.
[3] *Art poétique* (Paris, 1885), p. 56.
[4] *Ibid.* (Paris, 1548), p. 74.
[5] Amsterdam edition, 1723, Book VII, cols. 701, 714.

Salel did not fare so well at the hands of later historians of French literature; they found his verse dry, colorless, prosaic. Only occasionally do we read an appreciation of his works, and then it refers not to the translation of the *Iliad* but to his short poems.

III

POEMS AND TRANSLATIONS FROM THE LATIN AND ITALIAN

In 1540 Salel published a collection of poems several of which had already been circulated in manuscript among the poets of his circle.[1] This volume contained translations from Pontanus and other Neo-Latin poets, and several translations and paraphrases from Petrarch. Two "blasons," one "De l'Epingle" and the other "de l'Aneau," show that Salel was not only a Petrarchist but also a "blasonneur," and he took part in the famous "Querelle des Femmes." In a lengthy poem, *Eclogue Marine*, on the death of the Dauphin in 1536, he introduces Mellin de Saint-Gelais and Victor Brodeau as mariners, and it is through the *Eclogue* that Salel and Mellin became acquainted. The poem was undoubtedly imitated by Charles Fontaine in his "Eclogue Marine" (published in the *Ruisseaux*).[2]

Jean de Boyssonné speaks of the *Eclogue* on sending Salel some Latin verses: "Ecce ad te mitto quae de tua Egloga nuper carmine iambico lusimus: Epigramma quidem leve neque satis dignum quod a doctis legatur, nedum ut laudari debeat."[3] Boyssonné was very much impressed with Salel's poems, but complains that since he is a poet at court he neglects his friends. He reproaches Salel for not having mentioned his Latin and French poems which he addressed to the poet of Quercy.[4]

Charles de Sainte-Marthe was influenced by Salel's Petrarchistic verse but caught more of the spirit of the Italian poet than did his

[1] *Les Œuvres de Hugues Salel, valet de chambre / ordinaire du Roy, imprimees par / commandement dudict seigneur . . .* , Paris, Estienne Roffet. Privilege dated twenty-third of February, 1539, which is 1540.

[2] Cf. Hawkins, "Charles Fontaine," *Harvard University Studies in Romance Literature* (1916), p. 193.

[3] Buche, *Rev. des langues romanes* (1896), p. 367. The verses are entitled "Franciscus Valesius Delph, loquitur de egloga Salellii" (J. a B. iamb. lib. I, fo. 105 v., 106 *r*. Library of Toulouse, MS 835).

[4] *Hendecasyl.*, I, xxvi, fo. 16. Mugnier mentions another poem addressed to Salel, in which Boyssonné expresses his preference for Latin verse (p. 420).

compatriot. Like Marot, he wrote a poem on Salel's devise (*Honneur te guide*). In this poem he admires Salel's "science" and his "prudence." Dr. Ruutz-Rees, in her book on Sainte-Marthe, says: "It was probably to Salel that Sainte-Marthe owed the idea of inspiring himself from Aelian for his *Tempé de France*, as had the former for his poem *De la misère et inconstance de la vie humaine*.[1] In the *Tempé de France* Sainte-Marthe writes of Salel:

> Salel escrit de telle dignité,
> Et ses escripts si saigement compasse,
> Qu'il n'est aulcun qui en ce l'oultrepasse.
>
> [Ruutz-Rees, p. 542.]

Salel also translated the *Triumphs* of Petrarch, beginning with the *Triumph of Time* and ending with the *Triumph of Death*, and he imitated an idyl of Ausonius in his *Chant poétique auquel Cupido est tourmenté par Venus*. He wrote a long poem entitled *Chasse royale contenant la prise du sanglier Discord par le très chrestien et tres puissant Roy Francoys, premier de ce nom*.[2] The subject of the poem is allegoric and treats of the war with the Milanese, whom the poet represents as the wild boar Discord, which is the object of the royal chase of Charles V and Francis I. The poem is very vague, confused, obscure, and strange, but the editors find that it deserves a place in the *Cabinet* because it enjoyed great success at the court of Francis I, as is proved by the ode which Olivier de Magny addressed to Salel on that subject. The author of the notes thinks that, in spite of the fact that Salel was an "abbé" he must have been a hunter, for he saw the manuscript of the *Chasse Royale*, now at the Bibliothèque Nationale, which was executed at the order of the Abbé de Saint-Chéron, and had on the first page a miniature representing a hunt in the woods of the domain of the abbey.[3]

Another important poem in the *Œuvres* was that on *La nativité de monseigneur le duc, fils premier de monseigneur le Daulphin*. This poem was later reprinted separately (1543), which shows that it too found favor with sixteenth-century readers.[4]

[1] C. Ruutz-Rees, *Charles de Sainte-Marthe* (1910), p. 274.

[2] Reprinted by Jullien and Lacroix in the *Cabinet de Vénerie*, II (Paris, 1882), 58.

[3] *Op. cit.*, "Notice," pp. 11 ff.

[4] Cf. Montaiglon, *Recueil*, II, 229.

As in the case of the *Iliad*, Salel's contemporaries and the Pléiade were not sparing in their eulogies of his poems. Rabelais was one of the first to put Salel in the same category with Marot and others. He says: "Je contemple ung grand tas de Colinets, Marots, Herouets, Saingelais, Salels, Masuels, & une longue centurie d'aultres Poetes & Orateurs Gallicques."[1] Of course, the word "tas" is not very complimentary, but Rabelais could have omitted Salel from the list. Salel, on the other hand, dedicated a very eulogistic dixain to the author of *Pantagruel* as an introduction to Book II.

Mellin de Saint-Gelais, whom Salel introduced in his *Eclogue* as mourning the death of the Dauphin, addressed a poem to Salel, "Poete jusqu'a maintenant de Moy inconnu":

> Mais toy, Salel, de ton heureux sejour
> As fait à coup un midi apparoistre,
> Qui esclaircit le lieu qui te voit naistre.[2]

The ease in which Salel lived seems to have been the envy of his poet friends. He knew none of the pangs of hunger which they endured, and he received immediate recognition. Du Bellay, in *La Musagnoemachie*, says of the celebrated translator:

> Salel, que la France auoüe
> L'autre gloire de Querci (Marty-Laveaux, Vol. I, p. 145).

In the first preface to the *Olive* he states: "Il me suffit pour tous lecteurs avoir un S. Gelais, un Heroët, un de Ronsart, un Carles, un Scève, un Bouju, un SALEL, un Martin, et si quelques autres sont encor à mettre en ce ranc." Contemporary critics would surely not put the above-mentioned poets in the same category.

Paul Angier, in the *Expérience de M. Paul Angier, Carentois, contenant une briefve défense en la personne d'Honneste Amant de Court contre la Contr'amye*, puts Salel in a list with Marot, Saint-Gelais, Heroët, Borderie, Rabelais, Scève, and Chapuy, whose disciple he claims to be (1544), while Chappuis, in the *Discours de la court*, also includes him among the foremost poets.[3]

Etienne Dolet considers Salel a first-rate poet. In the "Epistre" which accompanies Dolet's *Avant naissance de Claude Dolet*, the

[1] Marty-Laveaux, Vol. III, p. 7 (Prologue to Book V).
[2] Mellin de Saint-Gelais, Paris, 1873, Vol. II, No. xxii.
[3] Ruutz-Rees, *Ch. de Sainte-Marthe*, p. 206.

anonymous writer says that the Latin work of Dolet deserves a better translator than he, as would be Maurice Scève, Saint Amboise, Heroët, Brodeau, Saint-Gelais, or Salel, "poète aultant plus excellent que peu congneu entre les vulgaires."[1]

Sibilet, in the *Art poétique*, speaks of Salel as one of the "bons espris" among which one finds Marot, Saint-Gelais, Heroët, Scève, and others (*De l'inuention*, chap. iii, p. 7). In his chapter on rhyme he includes Salel among those who use "rime riche" (chap. vii, p. 22). He sees nothing wrong in such rhyme as "*ioindre* contre *conioindre:* & telle ryme a proportion pareille: attendu nommément que Marot, Saingelais, Salel, Herouet, Sceue, et tous les sauans & famés Poëtes de ce temps en usent ordinairement & sans scrupule" (p. 25).

Among the later critics Brantôme was one who did not see any merit in Marot or in his disciples. Speaking of the Pléiade he says "Ces poètes ont esté bien autres qu'un Marot, un Salel, et un Sainct-Gelays."[2]

Salel appealed to Ronsard and Du Bellay, whom he considered authorities on the subject, asking them to teach him to write love poems, for he felt that he was not gifted for such verse:

> O francs espritz savans enamourez,
> Si vous avez telz plaisirs savourez,
> Je vous suplie, acordez vostre lire
> Et de voz vers a present secourez,
> Chantant pour luy ce qu'il ne pourroit dire.[3]

These lines show that Salel held the poets of the Pléiade in as high an esteem as they held his verse.

From these citations it will be evident that Hugues Salel was considered one of the foremost poets of the sixteenth century. The paucity of biographical data and the fact that he was intimately connected with all the phases of the literary movement of the period show that he is worthy of an exhaustive study.

HÉLÈNE J. HARVITT

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

[1] *Catalogue Rothschild*, I, 448.
[2] Ed. Mérimée Lacour, 1875, Vol. IV, p. 124.
[3] Cf. Chamard, *Joachim du Bellay* (1900), p. 491.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

The Novels of Ferdinand Fabre. By Ray P. Bowen. Boston: R. G. Badger, 1918. Pp. 138. $1.25 net.

This interesting study, though slight and sketchy in some of its features, helps to place Fabre among the writers of the realistic generation. The volume includes an account of Fabre's life and career; a chapter on the classification of the novels; another on *Les Courbezon*, as setting the author's pace; then successive chapters on the autobiographical novels, those of peasant life, and those concerning the Church. A good conclusion and a bibliography appear at the end of the work.

The first biographical chapter is very satisfactory and offers much new material; but one wonders to what extent Fabre's fiction should be used among the biographical sources. The points emphasized are: the Southerner's *sensibilité*, his training for the church and subsequent withdrawal from the fold; his knowledge of Languedoc and ignorance of Paris, where he seems to have been isolated for some time; his gradual success in his chosen limited field. The threefold classification of the novels is about the best that can be done and is in accordance with critical tradition. The ecclesiastical fiction should, however, be considered as the core of Fabre's work. Mr. Bowen's analysis is open to objection in two other respects: he mentions but does not sufficiently stress the intermingling of kinds, the fact that autobiography, the peasantry, and especially the Church reappear at all stages in Fabre's career. Consequently the secondary division, according to chronology, becomes confused with the logical division and does not show any consistent development. Perhaps this is Fabre's characteristic rather than Mr. Bowen's fault; and one may admit a certain growth in anticlerical feeling during the novelist's second period, and the fact that his last period, like that of George Sand, is marked a return to the scenes of his youth.

Fabre appears then as a belated representative of *le roman personnel*, as a regionalist, and as a realistic delineator of peasantry and clergy. It should be more emphasized that he protrays these classes according to the virtues and vices of each; the ambition and pride of the priesthood are contrasted with their charity and simpilicty. This agrees with the naturalistic program, from Diderot to Balzac, and Mr. Bowen might well have made more of the Balzacian features of Fabre's realism. The Abbé Tigrane, in particular, offers close parallels with the Curé of Tours, and the animalism of peasant life as displayed by Fabre, is first rendered by Balzac. Yet a certain apartness is to be found in the work of Fabre, autodidactic, isolated in his formative years, coming between the romantic and the realistic groups. The points of similarity with Hardy and with Trollope seem well taken.

The novels most discussed and most highly placed are these: *Les Courbezon*, the road-breaker, uniting all three kinds; *Mon Oncle Célestin*, with its central figure of the good priest, still with a strong autobiographical tinge; *Le Chevrier*, a study of the Languedoc peasantry (cf. *Modern Philology*, XV, 171 ff.), which Fabre generally views from a position intermediate between the idealism of Sand and the naturalism of Balzac (cf. p. 91); *L'Abbé Tigrane*, the ecclesiastical masterpiece, and the best known of the list.

Mr. Bowen's treatment, while pleasant and informing, lacks intensity of critical analysis and definiteness of presentation. A similar softness of outline appears in his style. These faults, while not excessive, might have been remedied by more reading in French criticism and more use of the same in the present study, which (apart from its valuable biography) offers, as a critical contribution, mainly the repetition of a few salient points.

E. P. DARGAN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Historia de Litteratura Classica (1502–1580). By FIDELINO DE FIGUEIREDO. Lisboa: Livraria Classica Editora de A. M. Teixeira, 1917.

Characteristics of Portuguese Literature. By FIDELINO DE FIGUEIREDO. Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade, 1916.

The author of the above-mentioned works makes no pretense to scientific method. He expressly warns his readers that he has no new biographical or bibliographical facts to offer concerning the authors he treats. In the first of these books he presents his personal appreciation of the classic masterpieces of Portuguese literature. The value of this very subjective criticism can only be appraised by one better acquainted with the subject than the present reviewer. Gil Vicente, Sá de Miranda, and Camões are fully treated. There are chapters on the classic drama, the lyric poets, the novelists, the historians, and the mystics. The volume is well written and readable throughout.

The second work is a translation from the Portuguese of an article which first appeared in the *Revista de Historia*. Senhor Figueiredo finds that the following are the distinctive traits of Portuguese literature: Great interest in navigation and discovery, the result of Portugal's prominent part in the prosecution of geographical research; predominance of lyricism; fondness for epic poetry, a genre for which the Portuguese have much talent; scarcity of the drama; absence of both the philosophical and the critical spirit; aloofness from the public and a certain mysticism of thought and sentiment. Spanish literature shares some of these traits. The chief distinction would seem to be that the genius of Spain is predominatingly realistic, while that of Portugal is lyric and idealistic. In the drama Spain is as strong as Portugal is weak.

G. T. NORTHUP

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVI *April 1919* NUMBER 12

CHAUCER AND LUCAN'S *PHARSALIA*

It has long been recognized that Chaucer had an acquaintance with Lucan's *Pharsalia*, but no definite effort has been made to determine to what extent he made use of it in his own writings. Professor Lowes referred to the relationship between the two poets in an article in the *Nation*[1] and indicated some investigations that he expects to prosecute with regard to Chaucer's knowledge of Lucan through translations when the cessation of hostilities will permit his examination of some MSS in Europe. As Professor Lowes says, Chaucer undoubtedly knew the Latin original. Though perhaps Chaucer was not a scholar in the modern sense, or even in the mediaeval—and for this let us be thankful—there is abundant evidence that his knowledge of the Latin classics was extensive. These investigations of Mr. Lowes with regard to Chaucer's relation not only to Lucan but also to Ovid and the other classical writers will certainly prove of great significance in estimating the diverse elements that entered into Chaucer's literary equipment. Meanwhile it may not be unprofitable to carry forward a critical comparison between Chaucer and his Latin originals which was undertaken some years ago, and some results of which have been printed in previous notes and articles.

In all of Chaucer's work there are four references to Lucan[2] by name: one in the *Troilus and Criseyde*, one in the *House of Fame*, one in the *Tale of the Man of Lawe*, and the fourth in the *Monk's Tale*.

[1] *Nation*, Supplement (December 21, 1916), p. 2.

[2] See Skeat, *Oxford Chaucer*, III, 279.

In the *Troilus and Criseyde* there is only the line giving the names of the great poets,

> Virgile, Ovyde, Omer, Lucan, and Stace.
> [*Troilus*, V, 1792.]

Here Lucan's name is joined with one, Homer, whose work Chaucer evidently did not know at first hand, and with three whom he did know, Virgil, Ovid, and Statius. This line, therefore, cannot justify any inference about Chaucer's acquaintance with Lucan.

In the *House of Fame* there is apparently a little more to go upon:

> Tho saugh I, on a piler hy,
> Of yren wrought ful sternely,
> The grete poete, daun Lucan,
> And on his shoulders bar up than,
> As highe as that I mighte see,
> The fame of Julius and Pompee.
> [*H.F.*, 1497–1502.]

It is evident from this passage that Chaucer knew that Lucan in the *Pharsalia* had much to say about Caesar and Pompey. Whether Chaucer knew this from his own reading of the Latin poet or got his information from someone else, this passage does not indicate.

In the *Tale of the Man of Lawe* Chaucer refers to Lucan as describing a great triumph of Julius Caesar:

> Noght trowe I the triumphe of Julius
> Of which that Lucan maketh swich a bost.
> [B 1, 400–401.]

Apparently the same idea is in Chaucer's mind when he says in the *Monk's Tale:*

> To Rome agayn repaireth Julius
> With his triumphe, laureat ful hye.
> [B 1, 3909–10.]

Upon this point of Chaucer's attributing an account of a triumph of Julius Caesar to Lucan, Professor Skeat says: "See Lucan's *Pharsalia*, iii. 79: 'Perdidit o qualem vincendo plura triumphum.' But Chaucer's reference, evidently made at random, is unlucky. Lucan laments that he had no triumph to record."[1] Professor Lounsbury explains Chaucer's mistake about the triumph as due to careless

[1] See Skeat, *Oxford Chaucer*, V, 153.

reading of Lucan.[1] The fact is, of course, that Lucan does not give any account of a triumph of Caesar because of his victory over Pompey, for Caesar never celebrated such a triumph. One can see, however, by reading the following passage in Lucan how Professor Lounsbury's suggestion might be correct:

> Pro, si remeasset in urbem,
> Gallorum tantum populis arctoque subacta,
> Quam seriem rerum longa praemittere pompa,
> Quas potuit belli facies! ut vincula Rheno
> Oceanoque daret, celsos ut Gallia currus
> Nobilis et flavis sequeretur mixta Britannis!
> Perdidit o qualem vincendo plura triumphum!
> [*Pharsalia* iii. 73–79.]

But two other passages in the *Pharsalia*, to which attention has not been called, might much more directly have suggested to Chaucer that Caesar expected to enjoy a triumph after his defeat of Pompey. The inference, therefore, that he did enjoy the triumph would be all the more natural. The first passage is:

> Campis prostrata iacere
> Agmina nostra putes; nec enim felicibus armis
> Misceri damnata decet, partemque triumphi
> Captos ferre tui; turba haec sua fata peregit,
> Hoc petimus, victos ne tecum vincere cogas.
> [*Pharsalia* iv. 358–62.]

Here the soldiers who have deserted Pompey's side and fled to Caesar are begging not to be made a part of Caesar's triumphal procession, assuming apparently that a triumph will certainly be enjoyed by him.

The second passage is a boast of Caesar himself in an address to his mutinous soldiers:

> Anne fugam Magni tanta cum classe secuntur
> Hesperiae gentes, nobis victoria turbam
> Non dabit, inpulsi tantum quae praemia belli
> Auferat et vestri rapta mercede laboris
> Lauriferos nullo comitetur volnere currus?
> Vos despecta, senes, exhaustaque sanguine turba
> Cernetis nostros iam plebs Romana triumphos.
> [*Pharsalia* v. 328–34.]

[1] Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer*, II, 254.

The first three stanzas "de Julio Caesare" in the *Monk's Tale* are a rapid summing up of the main facts in Lucan's *Pharsalia*. The lines

> Up roos he, Julius the conquerour,
> That wan al th' occident by lond and see,

appear to be Chaucer's condensation of Lucan's rather long roll call of the various Gallic and Germanic tribes that were subject to Caesar.[1] Lucan begins by saying,

> Caesar, ut acceptum tam prono milite bellum
> Fataque ferre videt, ne quo lanquore moretur
> Fortunam, sparsos per Gallica rura cohortes
> Evocat et Romam motis petit undique signis.

After enumerating the tribes Lucan tells of Caesar's advance into Italy and the terror that his coming created; and he is to be greatly feared because,

> Hunc inter Rhenum populos Alpemque jacentes
> Finibus arctois patriaque a sede revolsos,
> Pone sequi jussamque feris a gentibus urbem
> Romano spectanti rapi.

In the following lines about Pompey,

> That of th' orient hadde al the chivalrye
> As fer as that the day beginneth dawe,

Chaucer apparently is thinking of Lucan's exaltation of Pompey. In the *Pharsalia* Lucan represents Pompey, his hero, as the leader of all the nations of the East which have flocked to his standard because he is so great and famous as a general. In trying to arouse his soldiers to battle Pompey boasts of the nations that he has conquered.[2] A little later Lucan says that Pompey, when all hope in Italy is gone, looks toward the East and sends his oldest son to arouse the nations of the Orient.[3]

Though Pompey is his hero, Lucan of necessity gives Julius Caesar much prominence in his story. Pompey and Caesar are the two opposing forces struggling for control of the known world. Chaucer dramatically presents one as the conqueror of the Occident and the other as the leader of all the forces of the Orient.

In the line

> O mighty Cesar, that in Thessalye,

Chaucer indicates his knowledge of the country where the contest between Caesar and Pompey took place. The fact that Lucan

[1] See *Pharsalia* i. 393–465. [2] *Ibid.* ii. 583 ff. [3] *Ibid.* 628–44; see also vii. 360–64.

makes so much of Thessaly,[1] giving an account of its inhabitants, boundaries, mountains, and rivers, served no doubt to impress the name upon Chaucer's mind.

That the *Pharsalia* was in Chaucer's mind when he was writing this story of Julius Caesar seems clear from the fact that Chaucer stops his account of Caesar to bewail the fate of Pompey, of whom Lucan makes so much. In fact it is Pompey's fate with which the *Pharsalia* concerns itself.

> But now a litel whyl I wol biwaille
> This Pompeius, this noble governour
> Of Rome, which that fleigh at this bataille;
> I seye, oon of his men, a fals traitour
> His heed of smoot, to winnen him favour
> Of Julius, and him the heed he broghte.
> Allas Pompey, of th' orient conquerour
> That fortune unto swich a fyn thee broghte!

Of the three authors, Lucan, Suetonius, and Valerius, to whom Chaucer refers the reader in the closing stanza of this story of Julius Caesar, it is easy to see from which one he derived the very concrete statement that one of Pompey's own men cut off his head. Suetonius[2] merely says that Pompey was killed before Caesar's arrival. Valerius Maximus,[3] though mentioning the fact that Pompey's head was cut off, attributes it to Egyptian treachery. But Lucan gives in full the details which Chaucer evidently had in mind.[4]

It would seem clear enough that Chaucer names his authorities correctly when he says:

> Lucan, to thee this storie I recommende
> And to Sweton, and to Valerie also
> That of this storie wryten word and ende.

One of Chaucer's feats was condensing in brief form for his contemporaries the epic poems of some of the popular Latin poets. We find him giving a summary of the entire *Aeneid* in the first book of the *House of Fame*, and of the *Thebaid* toward the end of the *Troilus and Criseyde*. In the *Monk's Tale* he has summarized in three stanzas

[1] *Pharsalia* vi. 333–412.

[2] Suetonius *XII Caesares, C. Julius Caesar* 35.

[3] Valerius Maximus *De factis et dictis Memorabilibus*, v. 1, Sec. 10.

[4] *Pharsalia* viii. 592–673.

practically all the important points in Lucan's *Pharsalia*. The rest of the story of Julius Caesar, which Lucan, of course, does not tell—how Brutus Cassius, as Chaucer calls him, attacked Caesar, and how Caesar drew his mantle about him while dying—Chaucer obtained, as he says, from Suetonius[1] and Valerius Maximus.[2]

If Lucan was a popular poet in the Middle Ages[3] and Chaucer was acquainted with his poem, the question naturally arises, Why did Chaucer make so little use of Lucan in his works? The answer is not far to seek. Lucan's subject-matter and style in the *Pharsalia* were not such as to make an appeal to our English story-teller poet. Lucan's long speeches, eloquent as they are, smack of the rhetorician's art and seem to be introduced to display the poet's power of declamation, as do also the long descriptions of peoples and places in which he indulges. Consider, for instance, Lucan's ethnological and geographical account of Thessaly. To Lucan, Pompey was the representative of freedom, which was hopelessly crushed by Julius Caesar's superior force. Chaucer, however, had no concern with the political or historical events of antiquity, for

> They are gone: ay, ages long ago.

For instance, Chaucer cared nothing for Aeneas as the reputed founder of Rome and the ancestor of Augustus—matters of prime importance to Virgil—but he was intensely concerned with him as the lover and deserter of Dido. The constant appeal of Ovid's poetry to Chaucer consists in the varied manifestations presented by "Venus clerk" of the eternal human passions. Hence Chaucer's very much more extensive use of Ovid than of any other classical poet.

Though Chaucer doubtless enjoyed reading "the grete poete, daun Lucan," he found little to appropriate from his writings. Lucan's eloquent apostrophes to Pompey as the apostle of freedom made no appeal to a narrative poet like Chaucer, whose primary interest was in telling his story. The element of "human interest," for which Chaucer had so keen an appreciation, was not to be found in Lucan's *Pharsalia*.

EDGAR FINLEY SHANNON

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY

[1] Suetonius *XII Caesares, J. Caesar* 82.

[2] Valerius Maximus *De factis et dictis Memorabilibus* iv. 5.

[3] Sandys, *History of Classical Scholarship*, I, 641.

COLERIDGE AS A PHILOLOGIAN

Samuel Taylor Coleridge—logician, metaphysician, bard—was also, according to his lights, a scholar. The great and disjointed corpus of his works is freighted to a surprising degree with learning real or feigned, and his contemporaries were wont to be not less amazed at his erudition than they were startled at the occasional wildness of judgment and apparent indifference to exactitude which attended it. No survey of Coleridge's attainments in the field of literary and philological as opposed to philosophical scholarship has hitherto been made. The subject is, however, an interesting one, and an examination of his pretensions and accomplishments, a somewhat careful testing of the fact and fancy in his scholarly pronouncements, besides illustrating a comparatively unregarded aspect of his relation to his age, will be found to open a new approach to the understanding of his peculiar intellectual constitution and to throw important light on his critical and imaginative work.

We may consider at the outset his own attitude toward the sort of philological study in which at various periods of his life he found himself deeply engaged. The following passage, written at Göttingen in 1799, affords important evidence as to his point of view:

> My God! a miserable poet must he be, and a despicable metaphysician, whose acquirements have not cost him more trouble and reflection than all the learning of Tooke, Porson, and Parr united. With the advantage of a great library, learning is nothing—methinks, merely a sad excuse for being idle. Yet a man gets reputation by it, and reputation gets money; and for reputation I don't care a damn, but money—yes—money I must get by all honest ways. Therefore at the end of two or three years, if God grant me life, expect to see me come out with some horribly learned book, full of manuscript quotations from Laplandish and Patagonian authors, possibly on the striking resemblance of the Sweogothian and Sanscrit languages, and so on.[1]

In regarding the labor of thought as infinitely more severe than that of acquisition Coleridge is undoubtedly faithful to his own

[1] *Letters* (edited by E. H. Coleridge), p. 299.

experience. The pretense of a purely commercial object in his studies is, I think, affectation. Certain it is that he always considered sound knowledge an indispensable basis of poetic as well as of critical achievement. In a letter of 1796 to Joseph Cottle he gives the following notable prescription for the preparation of an epic poem:

> I should not think of devoting less than twenty years to an epic poem. Ten years to collect my materials, and warm my mind with universal science. I should be a tolerable mathematician. I would thoroughly understand Mechanics, Hydrostatics, Optics, and Astronomy; Botany, Metallurgy, Fossilism; Chemistry; Geology, Anatomy, Medicine; then the mind of man in all Travels, Voyages and Histories. So would I spend ten years; the next five in the composition of the poem, and the five last in the correction of it.[1]

Ludicrously Coleridgian as this may sound, it reveals an attitude of mind which is sincere and characteristic, and it serves to direct attention to a genuine and independent scholarly consciousness in Coleridge, as much at variance with the common conception of him as mere heir to misty speculations and poetic dreams, as it was with certain tendencies in his strangely contradictory nature. He differs sharply, be it observed, from other outstanding figures in the romantic group. For pure antiquarianism like that of Scott he had no interest. Neither is he led to seek the past in the service of the pictorial imagination. His study was directed rather to the search for truth; it embraced physical science as well as language, literature, and metaphysics; and it resulted in an attitude essentially akin to that of the great founders of modern scholarship. Whatever his shortcomings may have been, Coleridge was yet touched by the scientific viewpoint, as evidenced in a sense of the need of methods and standards for the testing of literary and historic fact, and of the importance of correct manuscript readings, of more accurate translation and interpretation made in the light of fuller linguistic knowledge, and of the historical approach to literature through an understanding of the conditions surrounding it.

For the practice of an exact and far-reaching scholarship Coleridge had the initial advantage of a really competent training. The rigid classical discipline of Christ's Hospital was completed at Cambridge, and in both institutions Coleridge distinguished himself, save for a

[1] Cottle's *Early Recollections*, I (1837), 192.

single year of unaccountable mental disorganization, by his effort and his proficiency. The zeal of acquisition attended him also during the subsequent era of pantisocracy and love, when his association with Robert Southey, while it deepened his enthusiasm, somewhat altered its direction.[1]

It is, however, the sojourn in Germany which is really epoch-making in Coleridge's intellectual development, and that in a way which appears not to have been clearly recognized by his biographers. It is not simply that he was among the first of Englishmen to value contemporary German literature, for here William Taylor, of Norwich, had been his predecessor in the field, while DeQuincey and Carlyle were soon to go far beyond him. What distinguishes Coleridge's contact with modern Germany was the fact that he felt more than others its intellectual currents, not in philosophy alone,[2] but in science and literary scholarship as well. It is of quite as much importance that he submitted himself for a half-year to the discipline of one of its most progressive universities, at the moment when the fruits of the early development of a new learning were just beginning to be felt, as it is that he met and talked with Klopstock. Although Coleridge had been led to Germany in the first instance by the attraction of Schiller, Voss, and Wieland, he actually concerned himself, after a brief period spent in mastering the language, scarcely at all with the writers after Lessing.

The avowed object of the expedition was to acquire the language and "to furnish ourselves with a tolerable knowledge of natural science." Separating from the Wordsworths after a few days in Hamburg, Coleridge went into scholarly retirement at Ratzeburg and set about the study of German according to a definitely conceived and excellent theory of linguistic acquisition.[3] In February, 1799, he matriculated at Göttingen and settled down for five months of practically uninterrupted study.

Coleridge's choice of a university is of considerable importance. Göttingen was at this time pre-eminently the German university for

[1] The record of the books drawn by Coleridge and Southey from the Bristol Library (see *Chamber's Journal*, 1890, p. 75) gives the earliest evidences of Coleridge's interest in the literature of Italy and the North and in the minor Elizabethan drama.

[2] Coleridge remarks (*Biographia literaria* [ed. Shawcross], I, 141) that he became acquainted with the German philosophers for the most part "long afterwards."

[3] See *Biographia literaria*, chap. x, note.

English students, and Coleridge, through his special relations to the faculty, was in a particularly favorable position to feel the scholarly and intellectual impulses of the institution.[1] Göttingen was then the most modern and universal, as it was the youngest, of the German universities. The presence of Gesner, followed in 1763 by Heyne, had made it the leader of the new humanism which was revolutionizing the study of the classics in the German universities[2] and was already producing its effect on German literature and thought. There is evidence in Coleridge's later work that he felt the stimulus of these new ideals. The cultural view of ancient literature, championed by Heyne, involving the idea of considering the classics in relation to the total civilization of antiquity—its customs, mythology, art, and thought—was in entire accord with Coleridge's sympathies and interests. Something of this he may indeed have obtained from Blackwell, Wood, and other English sources, but in general it was the merely learned attitude which prevailed in the English universities where he had received his initiation into classical studies, while in Göttingen, under the leadership of Heyne, the bent of scholarship had been determined by the more liberal humanism of the new era. Winckleman and Herder had been Heyne's friends and correspondents, Wolf was his pupil, and it is unlikely that Coleridge should have escaped the enthusiasm of the place and hour. The fruits of the historical attitude in general and, as we shall see, of the new classical scholarship in particular are apparent everywhere in his criticism.

Of greater importance, however, for Coleridge's future development was his contact with the more novel current of German scholarship which was just beginning to be felt in Göttingen. The championship of the older German literature as an object of appreciation and study and the corresponding philological interest in the Teutonic dialects were, it is true, in the hands of other men than the Göttingen professors. A regular professor of German literature was not

[1] Coleridge sought out Heyne, librarian and reigning professor of the day, who received him with special courtesy and gave him unlimited privileges in the library (*Letters*, p. 279). This is not surprising considering Heyne's fondness for English literature. See Heeren's *Christian Gottlob Heyne*. It was, however, the famous physiologist and anthropologist Blumenbach who ultimately did for him the honors of the institution. He was an intimate in the latter's house and made the ascent of the Brocken in company with his son.

[2] See Paulsen, *Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts*, Book IV, chap. ii.

appointed there until after Coleridge's time,[1] but the close association of Heyne with men like Herder, Tieck, and Schlegel, and the existence in Göttingen of the Deutsche Gesellschaft, founded by Gesner for the improvement of the German language through translations from ancient and modern authors and for the study of the poetry, history, and antiquities of the fatherland, was sufficient to insure a pervasive interest in these matters in the academic community. It is important to note that neither the teachers nor the students at Göttingen were thoroughgoing specialists. The temper of the time encouraged men like Heyne and Blumenbach to range beyond their special fields.[2] This, with the absence of a chair of German literature, explains the somewhat surprising fact that Coleridge received his instruction in the Teutonic dialects from Thomas Tychsen, specialist in oriental literature and professor of theology from 1785 to 1834.[3] With him Coleridge, reading privately, for he gave no lectures in this field, learned "as much of Gothic as sufficed to make me acquainted with its grammar and the radical words of most frequent occurrence," and read through, with occasional assistance, Otfrid and "the most important remains of the Theotiscan or the transitional state of the Teutonic language from the Gothic to the Old German of the Swabian period." He made what must have been his first acquaintance with Continental mediaeval romance and "labored through" the master-singers, including Hans Sachs.[4] The interest of Coleridge was at the same time literary and philological. He had come for a knowledge of German, and his conception of a mastery of the language involved a knowledge of its history, just as the ideal which he set for himself as an expounder of modern German literature involved familiarity with that literature from its primitive beginnings.[5] The historical and philological purpose so clearly conceived shows Coleridge to have

[1] For information as to the curriculum, faculty, etc., at Göttingen see J. S. Pütter, *Versuch einer academischen Gelehrten-geschichte von der Georg-Augustus Universität zu Göttingen*, 1765–1838.

[2] Paulsen, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

[3] E. H. Coleridge is in error in supposing the Tychsen from whom Coleridge received instruction to have been Oläus Tychsen, professor at Rostock in Mecklenburg-Schwerin (*Letters*, p. 298, note).

[4] See the account of his studies in *Biographia literaria*, chap. x (Shawcross, ed., I, 138 ff.).

[5] He felt also that his knowledge of the English language had benefited by his study of the Teutonic dialects. See *Letters*, pp. 267–68.

been in line with the scholarly movement which, in men like Ritson and Warton, marked the development of English romanticism. The uniqueness of Coleridge's position consisted in his having been the first Englishman to receive this historical training in German as distinct from English and general Teutonic literature, and in his having done so under the scholarly methods of a modern German university.

Nor did Coleridge undergo the discipline in any listless fashion. "For these four months I have worked harder than, I trust almighty God, I shall ever have occasion to work again," he writes to Wedgwood in May, 1799,[1] and in the *Biographia* he remarks: "I made the best use of my time and means; and there is no period of my life on which I can look back with such unmingled satisfaction." The half-year was indeed one of solid and significant accomplishment. Short as was the period of Coleridge's contact with the scholarship of modern Germany, it left an impress on his interests and ways of thought which is not to be neglected in the study of his literary life.

The fruits of Coleridge's academic training and of the private researches with which he supplemented it we may now examine. We must omit the long tale of his philosophical studies and fail to take account, for the most part, of his wide reading in English literature. Even aside from this his range is surprising enough. For the classics he maintained an enthusiasm throughout his life, and the evidence of his wide acquaintance with Greek authors is everywhere in his work. The interest in Greek is partly philological. He compiled for the use of his children a Greek grammar, called by his nephew "a truly marvellous monument of minute logical accuracy,"[2] he projected at one time a Greek lexicon,[3] and he frequently undertook the arduous work of an emender of texts and improver of translations. The value of his labors in this field is not very considerable, but the simple fact of his patient concern with these minutiae is not without its significence. If not quite a Porson in classical philology, Coleridge has enough of the scholarly consciousness to value accuracy of text and rendering as an ideal.

[1] Cottle's *Reminiscences*, p. 427.

[2] See editor's note to *Table Talk* (*Works*), VI, 284.

[3] *Biographia literaria*, chap. xii, note (Shawcross, ed., I, 164).

Of greater intrinsic interest are the evidences of Coleridge's aliveness to the broader problems of classical scholarship. Many of his more modern views are undoubtedly the fruit of the German contact; they are, however, usually propounded and argued for in characteristic fashion, as if they were entirely original. Coleridge, as is well known and as he himself avowed, was always sublimely indifferent to distinctions of intellectual proprietorship. Thus he was a consistent advocate of the composite authorship of the *Iliad*,[1] having, according to his own statement, reasoned it out on the basis of hints afforded by Vico in his *Scienza nova*. The hint in Vico was broad enough, amounting to an exposition of the theory in its essential features, but that Coleridge should not have known Wolf's *Prolegomena*, which had appeared in 1795, or should have heard nothing of the controversy which was raging in the Göttingen circle in his day, exceeds belief.[2]

In the field of classical tragedy Coleridge was perhaps more capable than any other Englishman of his time, by his training and endowment, of interpreting the best that had been said and done abroad. It has not been sufficiently recognized that his scholarship here put him in relation with a very important side of contemporary German activity which remained untouched by Taylor, or DeQuincey, or Carlyle. The fundamental principles of ancient drama expounded in the lectures of 1818[3] he derived from the *Vorlesungen* of Schlegel, who had been a pupil of Heyne's at Göttingen just before Coleridge's time, and whose work is in a broad sense the outcome of the humanistic movement to interpret ancient literature in the light of ancient life and thought. Especially important as opening up a vast field of modern research is Coleridge's endeavor to study Greek tragedy from the standpoint of the more primitive and ritualistic aspects of Greek religion. In his *Essay on the Fundamental Position of the Mysteries in Relation to Greek Tragedy*[4] he makes the

[1] *Works*, IV, 301; cf. *Table Talk* (*Works*) VI, 312–13.

[2] Heyne had himself handled the subject tentatively in his *De antiqua Homeri lectione* before the Göttingen academy. See Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, III, 41. The controversy on the subject between Wolf and Heyne began in 1797.

[3] *Works*, IV, 1 ff. See Anna A. Helmholtz, "The Indebtedness of Samuel Taylor Coleridge to August Wilhelm von Schlegel," *University of Wisconsin Bulletin* ("Phil. and Lit. Series"), III, No. 4 (1907), pp. 322–66.

[4] Summary in *Works*, IV, 366 ff. Cf. the essay on the *Prometheus*, read before the Royal Society of Literature, May 18, 1825, *Works*, IV, 344 ff.

distinction between the autochthonous worship of the ancient inhabitants of the Peloponnesus and the Olympian system, in a manner which looks forward to the recent work of Professor Murray and Miss Harrison, and he sought to find in the "secret doctrines of the Eleusynian and Samothracian mysteries" the ultimate explanation of ancient drama. This is a line of thought which Coleridge could not have derived from English sources, and it is not, like the critical discussions in the public lectures, based on Schlegel. The true source of these speculations lies in the lucubrations of the theorizing mythologists, who, following Heyne, had dwelt on the distinction between the older and later myths and had emphasized the mysteries, the Bacchic worship, and the Egyptian and Phoenician influences on the more primitive and essential forms of Greek worship. Creuzer's famous *Symbolik und Mythologie* (1810 ff.) contains much that is parallel with Coleridge's thought, but it is Schelling's pamphlet *Ueber die Gottheiten von Samothrace* (1815) to which Coleridge is directly indebted. Belief in the philosophic wisdom of the ancient myths, which is shared by Creuzer and Schelling, underlies Coleridge's interpretation of the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus, and his discussion of the Asiatic and Greek mythologies[1] takes all its detail, without acknowledgment, from Schelling. What interested Coleridge chiefly in this new line of investigation was the possibility it seemed to open up of finding in the Greek system an echo of the revealed religion of the Hebrews, transmitted through Phoenicia and Egypt. This historic error haunted Coleridge's thought, it distorted his view of the significance of recent developments in Egyptian archaeology, and it rendered him incapable of making fruitful use of the new insight which his studies had given him into the essence of Greek worship, or of applying scientifically the analogies which he suggests with the religious observance of primitive peoples like the American Indians. Both Creuzer and Schelling had recognized the fact that their researches tended to confirm the older idea of the Hebraic origin of Greek mythology, but they had done so tentatively and with the warning that God had left no people without a witness of the truth. The religious and conservative-minded Coleridge followed the *ignis*

[1] *Works*, IV, 309 ff. A reference to Schelling and Creuzer is given by the American editor.

fatuus which they had shunned, and the light which was in him became darkness.

With regard to legitimate Hebrew scholarship the present writer is unable to judge either of the originality or of the authenticity of the doctrine which Coleridge was fond of dispensing from his seat in Highgate. Certain it is that he had a yearning, at least, toward thoroughgoing orientalism as the basis for a proper comprehension of the Bible and was not blind to the importance of the higher criticism of his time. "I wish I understood Arabic," he remarks, "but it is not worth while to undergo the labour necessary to get any oriental tongue but Hebrew."

Another persistent interest of Coleridge's, fostered by his German studies but already manifested in his early years, is philology in the narrower sense of linguistics. Coleridge was undoubtedly fond of language study, both as a means of wider literary acquisition and for its own sake. Of his facility in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew and in the Germanic dialects I have already spoken. French he read with difficulty, preferring German translations of French works. His Italian he learned at Malta and during the seven months' sojourn in Italy. He could understand the spoken language well enough to converse with the elder Rossetti, the latter speaking Italian and Coleridge English. He read with facility and appears to have gone through the major Italian writers in the original;[1] but his pretensions, as usual, outran his accomplishment. His shortcomings are painfully apparent in his marginalia to Cary's *Dante*, where his attempts to correct the translation are in every case in vain. Coleridge's interest in the northern literatures had led him at least to dabble in Danish,[2] and his aspirations at one period extended to the Celtic

[1] See the notes on Petrarch in Coleridge's *Essays and Lectures* ("Everyman's Library"), pp. 226–31. He felt competent to lecture on Italian literature and suggested to Britton in 1819 that the audience should choose its own subjects! Among his projects was a translation of all of Boccaccio's works except the *Decameron* (Letter to Rogers, May, 1815, in P. W. Clayden's *Rogers and His Contemporaries*, I, 192). Fragmentary translations from Italian authors are scattered through his works: from Chiabrera in *The Friend*, essay 8; Machiavelli, *ibid.*, essay 16; Strozzi, *Biographia literaria*, chap. xvi, etc.

[2] See DeQuincey (ed. Masson), I, 314. Cf. Farley, *Scandinavian Influences in the English Romantic Movement*, p. 218. Coleridge promised translations from Swedish and Danish authors to his 1818 audience, but he deferred them to the end of the course, and there is no evidence that he ever read them. In 1800 he tells Thelwell that he amuses himself by studying the most ancient forms of the northern languages (Letter quoted by J. D. Campbell, *Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, p. 119). Farley finds no evidence that Coleridge could read Old Norse.

tongues and Basque! Of Coleridge's acquaintance with Spanish I know only that he projected a translation of Cervantes, which in his case is no evidence at all,[1] and that he makes some comments on the genius of the Spanish language.

The period of Coleridge's activities falls just too early for him to have come in contact with the modern development of scientific philology, but he did share the active interest in etymology and philosophical grammar which preceded in England and Germany the great discoveries of Schlegel, Bopp, and Grimm. His enthusiasm for such study was probably first aroused by Horne Tooke's influential *Diversions of Purley* (1786). He sent or was to have sent a copy of the book to Poole, with a special recommendation in 1798,[2] and though later he speaks abusively of the work, he borrows from it more than one idea or etymology. In Germany the new emphasis which was being placed on language as the expression of a people's spiritual life doubtless quickened Coleridge's zeal. His study of Gothic and Old High German under Tychsen would of necessity have been mainly philological in its emphasis. Blumenbach, moreover, with his theory of races, opened the way for much speculation on linguistic origins and relations; but on this point Coleridge can hardly be said to have kept abreast of the times. He appears from the remarks in *Table Talk*, February 24, 1827, to have been distantly acquainted with the new developments in the study of linguistic origins opened by the discovery of Sanskrit, but he is still groping after a single original speech, and he declares that the claims of Sanskrit for priority to the Hebrew are ridiculous.[3]

The evidence of Coleridge's passion for etymology, a passion, by the way, which was inherited by his son Derwent, is scattered everywhere in his writings. Like Carlyle, of whom in this, as in so many things, he was a predecessor, he frequently employs a derivation, usually false, to make a point. Like most English etymologists before him, he was seriously hampered by an ignorance of Anglo-Saxon. The most elementary knowledge would have prevented his

[1] Letter to Rogers, Clayden's *Rogers and His Contemporaries*, I, 192.

[2] See Poole's letter to Coleridge in Mrs. Sanford's *Thomas Poole and His Friends*, I, 280.

[3] *Works*, VI, 279. Leibnitz had long since overthrown the belief that Hebrew was the original language. F. von Schlegel's *The Language and Wisdom of the Indians*, which laid down the lines of Indo-European philology, had appeared in 1808.

blunder in *The Watchman* (III, 76), where he says that Whitsuntide, Whittentide, was the time of choosing the wits or wise men to the Witenagemot. Again, in his remarks about the article in *Table Talk*,[1] he seems to be guessing about the simplest facts of the history of the language. The heaviest count against Coleridge in all this is his entire unconsciousness of his limitations. The following conversation is an amusing example of his dogmatic pretensions and of his astounding power of self-delusion:

> Horne Tooke was once holding forth on language, when, turning to me, he asked me if I knew what the meaning of the final *-ive* was in English words. I said I thought I could tell what he, Horne Tooke himself, thought. "Why, what?" said he. "*Vis*," I replied; and he acknowledged that I had guessed right. I told him, however, that I could not agree with him, but believed that the final *-ive* came from *-ick—vicus*, ὅι κος; the root denoting collectivity, and that it was opposed to the final *-ing*, which signifies separation, particularity, and individual property, from *ingle*, a hearth, or one man's place or seat; ὅι κος, *vicus*, denoted an aggregation of *ingles*. The alteration of the *c* and *k* of the root into the *v* was evidently the work of the digammate power, and hence we find the *-icus* and *-ivus* indifferently as finals in Latin. . . . . Horne Tooke upon this said nothing to my etymology; but I believe he found he could not make a fool of me, as he did of Godwin and some other of his butts.[2]

This may have passed very well with the Highgate audience, but if any one of them had taken the trouble to consult the *Diversions of Purley* (2d ed., p. 675) he might have turned the joke back on Coleridge with good effect, for Tooke himself there gives the very explanation which Coleridge claimed to have propounded, even to the suggestion of the digamma as an intermediary step, and it was undoubtedly from this source that Coleridge derived the wisdom with which he pictures himself to have confounded a rival philologist in this truly imaginary conversation.

As a contributor to the science of language Coleridge's observations are in the highest degree worthless. There is, however, one phase of his philological reflection which seems to me to be of considerable importance. Many of his remarks connect themselves with questions of literary effect and combine the critical with the purely linguistic point of view. As Coleridge is concerned with the

[1] *Works*, VI, 309.

[2] *Table Talk* (*Works*), VI, 477.

qualities of excellence and difference in prose and poetic style, so he is also with the relative effects of different languages or of the same language in different stages of its development. In insisting on the individuality of languages Coleridge allies himself with a phase of the critical movement to preserve the national traditions in literature. His predecessors were both German and English. Welsted, for example, had expatiated on the acquired and natural advantages of the English tongue, the latter being such "as the other modern languages do not possess or not with equal happiness, as the power of compounding words, the variety of verse, the rhyme natural," etc.[1]

In like manner Coleridge uses his linguistic knowledge and his critical sense to define in detail, and often keenly, the individuality of languages. He speaks of the perfection of the Greek, comparing the Italian and Spanish, points out the value of the particles, comments on the expressiveness of the dual, and distinguishes the nature of Greek compounds, "the happy marriage of sweet sounds," which in our language are mere printers' compound epithets.[2] He notes how "in all societies there exists an instinct of growth, a certain collective unconscious good sense, working progressively to desynonymize those words of originally the same meaning which the conflux of dialects has supplied to the more homogeneous languages, as the Greek and German, and which the same cause, joined with the accidents of translation from the original work of different countries, occasion in mixed languages like our own."[3] Applied to particular literary types and to special authors, observations of this sort tend to slip over into the domain of literary criticism. Thus Coleridge maintains somewhat fancifully that English, by virtue of its composite character, is most appropriate to drama, "for it contains the harvest of the unconscious wisdom of various nations." He recognizes a definite relation between the genius of language and prose style, as in the lecture on Boccaccio,[4] where he says that the long inwoven periods were natural in Greek but are foreign even in Latin

[1] "Dissertation Concerning the Perfection of the English Language," Welsted's *Works*, ed. Nichols, 1787.

[2] Notes on Chapman's *Homer*, *Essays and Lectures*, p. 356.

[3] *Biographia literaria*, chap. iv (Shawcross ed.), I, 61. See also Coleridge's note. The remark quoted above is altogether the best philological observation which Coleridge anywhere makes.

[4] *Miscellanies* (ed. Ashe), p. 100.

and particularly so in Teutonic. He finds the want of adverbs in the *Iliad* to be a trait of the "objective style." From this it is but a step to the kind of criticism which constitutes one of Coleridge's most significant contributions, the comparison and philosophic analysis of prose and poetic diction. He distinguishes a specifically dramatic diction in Shakespeare, Milton, and Massinger, as he had recognized a specifically dramatic language in the English. It is in the same spirit that he maintains the validity of a poetic style fundamentally different from that of prose, in opposition to Wordsworth's contention that they are the same.[1]

If Coleridge's interest in the qualities and varieties of languages is closely associated with his criticism of literary styles and manners, his study of the older literatures of modern Europe is similarly connected both with his general critical activity and with his poetry. To what extent did Coleridge share in the mediaevalism of the English and German romantic schools in its more scholarly aspects? It must be admitted that mediaeval literature was with him no such exclusive and absorbing study as it was with Scott or Ritson. It is rather but one somewhat restricted phase of his eager literary curiosity. Coleridge's instinct, like Herder's, was to inquire broadly into the literary activity of the human spirit in all nations and periods. We have already noted the range of his German studies, directed toward a history of mediaeval German literature. In the course of his reading under Tychsen he appears to have acquired familiarity with the chief monuments of older German literature. He speaks appreciatively of Otfrid and translates a selection into attractive verse. Brandl thinks the passage to be closely related to the night scene in "Christabel"; it is certainly the source of the "Christmas Carol." Here then is a point of contact between Coleridge's mediaeval research and his creative work. His acquaintance with the Minnesänger leaves also an echo in the "Mutual Passion." The reading of Hans Sachs could scarcely afford an impetus to Coleridge's muse, but he speaks of "the rude strains of the cobbler of Nürenberg" as having given him at least a modest pleasure.[2] Coleridge's dramatic interests led him to pay special attention to the German

[1] *Biographia literaria*, chap. xviii (Shawcross ed.), II, 43 ff.

[2] For errors in Coleridge's remarks about Hans Sachs see note to *Biographia Literaria* (*Works*), III, 720.

mediaeval drama. He had transcribed at Helmstadt Hans Sachs's comedy, *Die ungleichen Kinder Evä*, and in his second lecture of 1818 he regaled his audience with an amusing analysis of the piece, his own fertile imagination supplying several picturesque touches not to be found in the original.[1] In his sketch of the evolution of mediaeval drama Coleridge follows Schlegel in the main,[2] but he had picked up in Italy some details relating to the extravagant presentations of the Christmas mysteries, and he is, so far as I know, original in finding in the Devil and the Vice genuine ancestors of Harlequin and the Clown.

Coleridge's relation to the more usual mediaeval interests of the English romanticists—namely, popular literature, the metrical romances, and the antiquities of popular custom and belief—demands a somewhat careful definition. Save for a brief discussion of the origin of the Maypole (*The Watchman*, Vol. III) and a few observations on folk customs which had interested him in Germany[3] there is no evidence that he was touched in any way by mere antiquarian curiosity about the life of the past and its survivals. Hence there is in his poetry no imaginative reconstruction of the Middle Ages in their external aspects. On the other hand Coleridge's conception of literature as an evolution corresponding with the development of the human mind through its various stages led him to devote some attention in his lectures to the more primitive forms of expression represented in ballad and romance.[4] Primarily, however, his interest in such materials was psychological, philosophical, and imaginative. They were to him the evidence of the instinct of the human mind toward belief in the supernatural, and as such they engaged his deepest attention. It was with this object that he aspired to write a treatise on "dreams, visions, ghosts, witchcraft," etc. For this sort of material Coleridge had a temperamental affinity quite different from Scott's merely curious interest, or from the artificial pretense of

[1] *Works*, IV, 238. Cain's bloody nose, the cuff bestowed by him on Adam, etc., are comic additions, conceived by Coleridge quite in the spirit of the original. His account of the last scene is almost entirely spurious. Either he wearied of the labor of transcription before he reached Act V, or he neglected to refer to his notes while preparing his discourse.

[2] *Progress of the Drama* (*Works*), IV, 29 ff.

[3] *New Monthly Magazine*, XLV, 218.

[4] See the first, second, and third of the lectures of 1818; cf. his remarks on the analogy between the Homeric poems and the English romances.

belief. With Coleridge the willing suspension of reason was something more than a literary and poetic phenomenon. Superstition, derived from popular sources, blending with his own consciousness of supersensuous reality, determines the essential imaginative content of his poetry. Thus in "The Three Graves," "The Ancient Mariner," and "Christabel," three familiar folk motives—the curse, the taboo, and the serpent woman—are assimilated with a completeness possible only to a poet to whom these beliefs not only afford an insight into human psychology but are the symbolic expressions of man's authentic relation to the unseen world. It is through this fundamental kinship of temperament and belief that Coleridge is enabled to penetrate to the spiritual essence of mediaeval life, while remaining indifferent to its outward forms. From the purely literary standpoint also Coleridge, like Wordsworth, was attracted toward the popular lyric, ballad, and romance, as is evident from his translation of "Wenn Ich ein Vöglein wär" from the *Wunderhorn*[1], by his imitation of ballad style in "The Ancient Mariner," "The Dark Ladie,"[2] etc., and by his revival of the romance form in "Christabel."

Toward the Scandinavian studies, which had by Coleridge's time become popular in England, he and his group had always shown a friendly interest, but the ground remained practically untrodden by his feet. Coleridge sent to Wordsworth a copy of Cottle's *Translations from Icelandic Poetry* (1797). He had read David Cranz's *History of Greenland* and the *Eddas*, and, as we have seen, had at least dabbled in the Danish and Swedish tongues, but neither in his poetry nor in his criticism does he show any evidence of having come fairly in contact with the northern source of romantic inspiration.

Of the various fields of modern literature in English with which Coleridge occupied himself, the Elizabethan drama is the only one in which his work is of a character to require close examination in this paper. We may select his rather extensive Shakespearean studies as a final example of the methods and results of his scholarship. Coleridge shared with Lamb a new enthusiasm for even the minor playwrights of the Elizabethan age, especially for Massinger, but he

[1] "Something Childish but Very Natural," *Poems*, p. 146.

[2] For an analysis of Coleridge's relation to the ballad see C. W. Stork, "The Influence of the Popular Ballad on Wordsworth and Coleridge," *PMLA*, XXIX, 299 ff.

regarded them less for their own sakes than as a means of obtaining a just estimate of the great luminary for whom he entertained an admiration amounting almost to superstitious awe. While Lamb is eclectic and antiquarian in his criticism, Coleridge, here as elsewhere, is at least in aim and general trend scientific and historical, as well as aesthetic. To the study of Shakespeare he devoted himself persistently throughout his life. At Cambridge he wrote essays to vindicate Shakespeare's art, and in the conversations of his last years he was still dispensing appreciative comments, elucidating obscure passages, pronouncing on questions of authorship, philosophizing about the characters, and emending the text. If Coleridge's Shakespeare criticism is honeycombed with error and distorted by wildness of judgment, it is not for want of a proper devotion to the object, nor is it for want of a critical ideal. Throughout his discussion of the dramas Coleridge shows a sincere desire to get at the meaning, to distinguish the genuine from the spurious, and to see the works in their proper literary and historical relations.

In this aim he is often too much dominated by the desire to find Shakespeare free from all imperfection. He strongly inclines to deny the poet's responsibility for whatever his own literary sense is unable to approve. Thus he repeatedly affirms that the Porter scene in *Macbeth* is an interpolation, but, finding in it one phrase—"the primrose path to the everlasting bonfire"—which is worthy of the master's pen, he is driven to the theory that Shakespeare accepted a "disgusting" interpolation of the actors and added to it this touch of genius.[1] In another passage (*Julius Caesar*, III, i), he refuses to recognize an obvious pun because, in his opinion, it mars a fine passage, though he knows perfectly well that it is in entire accord with Elizabethan practice. The conflict between the historical and the appreciative attitude in Coleridge is well illustrated in his opinions regarding the stage presentation of the dramas. His instinct inclined him to agree with Lamb that Shakespeare ought only to be read, yet he was fully conscious of the intimate relation of the plays to the stage and of the critical necessity of viewing them in the light of stage

[1] Coleridge's commentary on Shakespeare is for the most part contained in the notes on the various plays, *Works*, IV, 73 ff. Since the passages referred to are easily located, specific references will not ordinarily be given except to the acts and scenes of the plays.

conditions. "The condition of the stage and the character of the times in which a great poet flourished must be taken into account in considering the question as to his judgment."

Setting aside the purely literary and philosophical aspects of Coleridge's Shakespearean criticism, we find him chiefly concerned with questions of authorship, with the problem of chronology, and with the text. At three periods of his life he attempted a classification of the plays on a chronological basis. A comparison of these classifications is, as Furness remarks,[1] a study rather of Coleridge's mind than of Shakespeare's. Baffled by the scantiness of the external evidence collected by Malone, Coleridge makes the initial blunder of rejecting such evidence as there was. "If he were to adopt any theory," he told Collier, "it would be rather psychological and pathological than chronological." Yet in 1802 he had set down a chronological arrangement based on "the internal evidence of the writings themselves." In the first epoch he places what he calls *Uebergangswerke—Henry VI*, the old *King John*, *Pericles*, and other doubtful plays; in the second *All's Well* and *Romeo and Juliet* in their first versions, and *Two Gentlemen of Verona;* in the third and fourth the comedies and later histories; in the fifth ("The period of beauty was now passed; and that of grandeur succeeds") the tragedies, *Troilus and Cressida*, *Measure for Measure*, *Much Ado About Nothing*, and lastly *The Tempest*, *The Winter's Tale*, and *Cymbeline*. It would have been well if Coleridge had rested with this arrangement, which, except in the first group, where the fallibility even of his purely literary sense is well illustrated, is far from bad—is indeed more nearly in accord with modern opinion than Malone's latest chronology. The later attempts, except that he makes *Love's Labour's Lost* the earliest of the plays, are much inferior. *The Tempest*, for example, in 1810, gets into the second period and *Cymbeline* comes before the tragedies. The historical plays are here put last, "in order to be able to show my reasons for rejecting some whole plays and very many scenes in others." The weaknesses of the subjective method reflect themselves in the utter instability of his ideas. In his two subsequent discussions of the subject (1811 and 1819)[2] the system is modified at random.

[1] Variorum, *Cymbeline*, 445.

[2] *Miscellanies* (edited by Ashe), p. 59.

On one point Coleridge's literary insight enabled him to make a genuinely significant contribution. In all the chronologies he treats *All's Well That Ends Well* as an early play, assuming the existence of an earlier version, afterward worked up afresh. The idea that the play was originally a counterpart of *Love's Labour's Lost* was not a novel one, but Coleridge was the first to point out, as he did to Collier in 1811 and again in 1818, the two divergent styles in the present play.[1]

Coleridge's observations regarding authorship are not worth notice, except that they show his preoccupation with this problem and again reveal his tendency to base his judgment on subjective impressions. As a result his opinions are often unstable and self-contradictory, as if he had difficulty in remembering at one time the profound convictions of another. According to Crabb Robinson, Coleridge and Lamb erred together in the opinion that not a line of *Titus Andronicus* was Shakespeare's; but Coleridge later observed, with truer instinct, that Shakespeare was responsible for some passages. Again, while at one time he affirmed that Shakespeare wrote nothing of *Richard III* except the character of Richard—"certainly not the Lady Anne scene"[2]—he brings forward in a lecture the mediaeval tale of *Ywain* as the source from which "Shakespeare derived the strongly marked and extraordinary scene between Richard III and Lady Anne."

Of more importance than his attempts to fix Shakespearean chronology or to settle perplexing questions of authorship are Coleridge's labors as a commentator and textual critic. His rather wide familiarity with Elizabethan literature, his keen though not infallible instinct for the Shakespearean manner and point of view, and his power of suggestive and illuminating interpretation enabled him to make some permanent contribution to the body of Shakespearean commentary, a contribution which justifies the frequent appearance of his name in the notes of the modern Variorum edition. But here, as elsewhere, one must note the inevitable limitations. In the first

[1] Tolman, in his essay on *Love's Labour's Lost*, is in error in saying that the view that the play is a second version is not found in Coleridge. See Collier's edition of Shakespeare (1858, II, 529), and Coleridge's observation in the chronology of 1802—"afterwards worked up afresh, *umgearbeitet*, especially Parolles."

[2] Crabb Robinson's *Diary*, I, 309–10. Cf. *Works*, IV, 238.

place, Coleridge is deficient in his attention to the labors of his predecessors. He uses, as a rule, only the editions of Theobald and Warburton, though he shows familiarity also with Rowe, Farmer, Malone, and others. His shortcomings in this respect are illustrated by his frequent failure to observe that his comments have been anticipated, and by his adopting an error in interpretation which a knowledge of the better editions would have enabled him to correct.[1]

Coleridge's indifference to the editors is partly motivated by his scorn of them, and some of his keenest observations are devoted to the ridicule of their ineptitudes. His is the sentiment of the man of genius, who resents the dull attempt of the scholar to elucidate his literary idol by mere learning. "Oh! Theobald," he ejaculates on one occasion, "what a commentator thou wast when thou would'st profess to understand Shakespeare instead of collating the text."

In his strictures on his predecessors Coleridge is generally quite right. Again and again he assails their errors with a keen precision which leaves no room for further argument, and these remarks constitute the sanest and most illuminating part of his commentary.[2] But his own missteps in the treacherous ways of Shakespearean exegesis are of a character almost to have entitled him to join the sorry group of commentators who invoke the outraged spirit of the bard in Coleridge's projected satire.[3] In the matter of emendation the ridicule which he lavishes upon Theobald or Warburton or Malone comes back upon himself. Except when confronted with the meddlings of others he is anything but scientifically conservative about the text; and he is guilty of some suggestions which are unrivaled even in the eighteenth century for wild absurdity. Such

[1] See, for example, his fruitless speculation on the meaning of "loach" (*I Henry IV*, II, i, 23), which, though boggled by Warburton, had been correctly given by Johnson, Steevens, and Malone.

[2] See, for example, his attack on Theobald's defense of the supposed contradiction in Hamlet's "Undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveller returns" after he has recently interviewed a ghost. Theobald's heresy is not yet dead, but C. is in accord with the best modern opinion.

The conjecture "spare me" for "Phillip? Sparrow!" in *King John* (I, i, 232) is justly made game of by Coleridge, who correctly explains the remark as an allusion to Skelton's poem. For other instances of corrective criticism see notes on *Macbeth*, I, iii, 37; *Winter's Tale*, III, ii, 187; *Othello*, I, ii, 21; *Antony and Cleopatra*, I, i, 14; *Hamlet*, IV, vii, 118; *Julius Caesar* I, ii, 86; *Twelfth Night*, I, i, 14.

On the other hand Coleridge can do justice to a good comment, even in Warburton or Theobald, when he sees it. Cf. note to *Timon*, I, ii, 117.

[3] *Anima Poetae*, p. 88.

are his substitution of "monarch sire" for "mounting sire" (*Henry V*, II, iv, 57), and his classic transformation of Macbeth's "blanket of the dark" into the grotesque "blank height of the dark."[1] These absurdities, carelessly thrown off in conversation, are not seriously to be held against Coleridge; but when he would change "die" to the commonplace "live" in Henry V's

> We would not die in that man's company
> Who fears his fellowship to die with us,

we feel that he has shown a bluntness of literary perception not very different from the worst he abuses in Warburton. In his comment on *Merry Wives*, I, iii, 61, he wilfully overlooks an obvious meaning and emends in a fashion truly ingenious in error.[2]

Such wild guesses at truth are, after all, not very common in Coleridge. His very natural inclination was to settle nice questions in interpretation by his literary judgment, and while this is sometimes perverse, more often it guides him truly, making his comments suggestive even when they are not wholly acceptable.

Of that part of his comment which illustrates the philological and scientific trend in his intellectual constitution there are examples in his notes on the learned commentators. Alien as antiquarianism was to his interests, he is ready enough to bring mere learning to bear on Shakespeare whenever he conceives it to be illuminating. Occasionally his erudition is of the flighty sort displayed in the perversities of the *Table Talk*. Opinion may differ as to the soundness of his startling transformation of Doll Tearsheet into Doll Tear-street (street-walker, from *terere stratam*, thereby explaining the prince's remark, "This Doll Tearsheet should be some road."),[3] but when he tries to connect "enkindle" in Banquo's "That trusted home might yet enkindle you unto the throne" with "kind, kin, as where rabbits are said to kindle," we see the madman and the poet playing at ducks and drakes with the scholar, the result being a species of Shakespearean erudition which is, in truth, such stuff as philological dreams

[1] *Table Talk* (*Works*), VI, 312 and 508–9.

[2] "As many devils entertain; and 'To her, Boy, say I.'" Coleridge would read "As many devils entered swine!"

[3] *II Henry IV*, II, ii, 183. W. S. Walker believed that Coleridge's emendation should have been adopted long ago (*A Critical Examination of the Text of Shakespeare*, III, 135).

are made of. Yet Coleridge's linguistic curiosity, when sensibly directed to the observation of Elizabethan usage, undoubtedly helped him to interpret the text of the plays aright.[1]

In general then Coleridge's commentary, though wild enough at times, is not altogether a failure, even from the scholarly point of view. At its worst it shows him ready to make a close and critical study of the text the basis of the soaring structure of his appreciative and philosophical interpretation. If he is warped in his view of the facts by his tendency to rely on subjective impression and vain hypothesis, he is nevertheless here as elsewhere a seeker after truth, and it is due to the complexity of his consciousness that he was incapable of becoming a Theobald or a Malone.

The combination of traits revealed in these Shakespeare notes is, as we have seen, characteristic of the entire range of Coleridge's literary studies. We are confronted everywhere with evidence of the psychological weaknesses which impaired the validity of his search after basic fact—his constitutional inaccuracy, his proneness to sacrifice the fruits of observation and scientific reason to what he believed to be religious and philosophical truth, the treacherous strength of the imagination, which made him unable to distinguish the thoughts of others from his own and, in general, to see reality uncolored by the rainbow hues of his own consciousness. Robertson's scathing analysis of Coleridge's mental constitution[2] is hardly too severe; but Coleridge's "intellectual dishonesty" is seldom or never deliberate. It is closely associated, moreover, with the faculty which made him succeed as a poet where he failed as a scholar, as Robertson himself recognizes, when he says of "The Ancient Mariner," "The quality which in Coleridge had to serve for strength of character, namely, intellectual zeal, here attains to a sincerity which is perhaps

[1] The following interesting comment shows him hesitating, in his really earnest desire to find Shakespeare's true text and meaning, between the solid claims of his knowledge of the language and the more treacherous allurement of his sense of style:

> O, these encounterers, so glib of tongue,
> That give a coasting welcome ere it come.
> [*T. and C.*, IV, v, 19.]

Coleridge thinks that it should perhaps be "accosting" ("Accost her, Knight, accost"). Yet the other is "so Shakespearean," taking coasting as epithet and adjective of welcome. But then he cannot readily understand the meaning unless "ere it come" is changed to "ere they land." And so, regretfully, he reads "accosting welcome" and explains "that give welcome to a salute ere it comes." The emendation is adopted in all modern editions.

[2] *New Essays toward a Critical Method.*

only possible in virtue of a weak relation to actuality." The intellectual zeal, had it been uncrossed by the wilder metaphysical and imaginative strain and unimpaired by the ravages of opium, might have made of Coleridge a literary scholar of wider range and more penetrating insight than any of his contemporaries; but, unlike Goethe, he was incapable of combining a steady hold on outward truth with the ideality, the spiritual vision, the subjective consciousness of the poet. He is a true child of the romantic age in both his weakness and his strength.

JAMES HOLLY HANFORD

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

THE SOURCES OF WIELAND'S *DON SYLVIO*

Wieland once remarked, in conversation with Böttiger, that he had never written anything for which he had not found the material in some old romance, legend, or fabliau.[1] In the case of *Don Sylvio* borrowings from Cervantes were noted by contemporary reviewers,[2] and the author himself frankly admitted a certain resemblance to *Don Quixote*.[3] In our day the borrowings from Cervantes have been traced in detail by Stephan Tropsch[4] and Tjard W. Berger;[5] Augustus Wood[6] attributes Pedrillo's ludicrous slips of the tongue to the influence of Partridge in *Tom Jones* and of Slipslop in *Joseph Andrews*, whereas Karl Walter[7] shows the affinity in this respect between Pedrillo and Launcelot Gobbo in the *Merchant of Venice*. Tropsch[8] has also pointed out reminiscences from Lucian, while K. O. Mayer[9] has traced back many of Wieland's motives to the French fairy tales of his time.

It would seem, therefore, that the field had been pretty thoroughly covered. There exists, however, another work, now almost forgotten, which in its scope and tendency is very similar to *Don Sylvio*—so nearly identical, in fact, that its plan, together with that of *Don*

[1] *Literarische Zustände und Zeitgenossen. In Schilderungen aus Karl Aug. Böttiger's handschriftlichem Nachlasse*, I, 182. Herausgegeben von K. W. Böttiger, Leipzig, 1838. This conversation is dated February 28, 1796.

[2] Compare, for example, the review by Musaeus in the *Allgem. deutsche Bibliothek*, I, 2 (1765), p. 97: "Es herrscht hier freylich keine Originalmanier; die Stellung ist vom Cervantes und die Farbenmischung vom Fielding: allein der hauptphilosophische Gedanke, der dabey zum Grunde liegt, mag dem Verfasser eigen seyn, und kann ihm Ehre machen."

[3] *Der teutsche Merkur*, V (1774), 344, in a review of *Tobias Knaut:* "Gesezt aber auch, Tobias Knaut wäre ungefehr so eine Nachahmung des Tristrams, wie der weibliche Don Quichotte, oder wie Don Sylvio Nachahmungen des Spanischen Don Quichotte sind."

[4] "Wielands *Don Sylvio* und Cervantes' *Don Quijote*," *Euphorion*, 4. Ergänzungsheft (1899), pp. 32–61.

[5] "*Don Quixote*" *in Deutschland und sein Einfluss auf den deutschen Roman (1613–1800)*. Heidelberg Diss., 1908.

[6] *Einfluss Fieldings auf die deutsche Literatur*. Heidelberg Diss., Yokohama, 1895.

[7] *Chronologie der Werke C. M. Wielands (1750–1760)*. Greifswald Diss., 1904.

[8] *Ztsch. f. vergl. Literaturgeschichte*, N.F., XII (1898), 454–56.

[9] *Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturgeschichte*, V (1892), 392–408.

Quixote, gives an adequate foundation for the entire structure of Wieland's romance. The book in question bears the title:

Voyage Merveilleux du Prince Fan-Férédin dans la Romancie; Contenant Plusieurs Observations Historiques, Géographiques, Physiques, Critiques & Morales. A Paris, Chez P. G. Le Mercier, ruë S. Jaques, au Livre d'Or. M.DCC.XXXV. Avec Approbation & Privilege du Roy.

In addition to the title-page, printed in red and black, there are vi pages+2 leaves+275 pages of text in small octavo. According to Barbier[1] a second edition appeared in the same year at Amsterdam, and a third in 1738 at Paris. Wieland therefore had abundant opportunity to become acquainted with the work, which was later reprinted in Volume XXIX of the *Voyages imaginaires*,[2] where, however, the Dedication, most important for our purposes, is lacking. The work is discussed by O. De Gourcuff in "Deux voyages imaginaires écrits par des Bretons," *Revue de Bretagne* (1891), which I have not seen.

The anonymous author of the *Voyage merveilleux* was Guillaume Hyacinthe Bougeant, a Jesuit, who was born at Quimper in 1690 and died at Paris in 1743.[3] In addition to historical and theological works he wrote: *Anacréon et Sapho, dialogues en vers grecs* (1712); *Le Saint déniché, ou la Banqueroute des marchands de miracles, comédie en cinque actes* (1732); *Amusements philosophiques sur le langage des bêtes* (1739).

The *Voyage merveilleux*, doubtless on account of the footnote on page 3, is usually described as a "critique ingenieuse du livre de *L'Usage des Romans*, par Lenglet-Dufresnoy." It contains, however, numerous similar thrusts at other novelistic and romantic literature in vogue at the time, such as *Cyrano de Bergerac, Le Roman de l'Astrée, Cleveland, Les Avantures d'un homme de qualité, La Princesse de Cleves*, and *Manon Lescaut*, to say nothing of the *Contes des Fées, Contes Chinois, Contes Peruviens*, and the current mediaeval romances of

[1] *Dictionnaire des ouvrages anonymes*, 3. éd., 1879.

[2] *Voyages imaginaires, songes, visions, et romans merveilleux*, recueillis par Garnier. Paris, 1787–95, 39 vols. There are copies in the libraries of Congress, of the Johns Hopkins University, and of the Peabody Institute.

[3] Cf. J.-M. Quérard, *La France littéraire, ou Dictionnaire bibliographique*, Paris, 1827. The title is incorrectly given (I, 447) as *Voyage ... dans la Romanie*, and this misprint is perpetuated in Lanson's *Manuel bibliographique*.

knightly adventure. A discussion of these matters, however, is not essential here. The author's aim is clearly set forth in his Dedication, addressed to Madame C— B—:

Non, Madame, je ne connois point de méchanceté pareille à celle que vous m'avez faite. Il faut que le Public en soit juge; je ne puis souffrir les Romans, vous le sçavez. Je vois que vous les aimez, & je vous en fais la guerre. Vous me demandez pourquoi: je vous dis mes raisons; & comme si vous étiez disposée à vous laisser persuader, finement vous m'engagez à les mettre par écrit. Mais quoi! faire une dissertation raisonnée, une controverse de Casuiste ou de Philosophe pédant? Non, dis-je en homme d'esprit; il faut donner à mes raisons un tour agréable, les envelopper sous quelque idée riante, sous quelque fiction qui amuse; & pour cela j'imagine le Voyage Merveilleux du Prince Fan-Férédin. Le voilà fait: c'est un Roman; & c'est moi qui l'ai fait. O Ciel! c'est-à-dire, que vous avez trouvé le moyen de me faire faire un Roman, à moi l'ennemi déclaré des Romans, & cela dans le tems que je vous reproche de les aimer. Avouëz-le, Madame: c'est-là ce qu'on appelle une trahison, une noirceur. Mais je serai vengé. Vous n'aimez pas les loüanges; privilege bien singulier pour une femme. Vous abhorrez une Epître Dédicatoire, vous me l'avez dit.[1] . . . Gardez-moi donc le secret, je vous prie, comme je vous le garderai; & je vous promets de plus que si ce petit Ouvrage répond à mes intentions, en vous inspirant à vous & à ceux qui le liront, un juste dégoût de la lecture des Romans, je vous pardonnerai de me l'avoir fait écrire. J'ai l'honneur d'être, Madame, Votre très-humble & très-obéissant serviteur * * *

We have here, clearly expressed and motivated, the satire upon the popularity of fairy-tale literature with which Wieland is sometimes credited, and Gervinus' criticism of *Don Sylvio* thus loses its point as far as Wieland is concerned:[2]

Er setzt also als Vertreter der schwärmerischen Verirrungen den Geschmack der Feenmärchen, der damals in Frankreich herrschte. Aber in Deutschland waren diese Dinge kaum durch die nürnberger Uebersetzung des Kabinets der Feen bekannt, und der Hieb fiel also ganz flach.

An analysis of the story proper will enable us to compare its plan with that of *Don Sylvio*.

The education of Prince Fan-Férédin was directed by his mother, Queen Fan-Férédine. The latter cared little enough for romances, but, having read by chance the assertion that nothing was more

[1] In the omitted portion the author threatens to reveal the lady's identity but finally desists on reflecting that she could revenge herself by publishing his name.

[2] *Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung*, IV (5. Aufl., 1873), 308.

suited to form the heart and mind of youth, she felt in conscience bound to make the young prince read as much as possible of *romans*, so as to inspire him betimes with the love of virtue and honor, a horror of vice, the avoidance of the passions, and a taste for things true and great. He soon perceived the fruits of such a laudable education:

> Agité de mille mouvemens inconnus, le cœur plein de beaux sentimens, & l'esprit rempli de grandes idées, je commençai à me dégoûter de tout ce qui m'environnoit. Quelle différence, disois-je, de ce que je vois & de tout ce que j'entends, avec ce que je lis dans les Romans! Je vois ici tout le monde s'occuper d'objets d'intérêt, de fortune, d'établissement, ou de plaisirs frivoles. Nulle avanture singuliere: nulle entreprise héroïque [pp. 3–4].

The hero accordingly determines to abandon his land, to seek the marvelous land of Romance. Having secretly provided himself with everything necessary for the expedition, he begins his quest on a beautiful moonlit night. Mountains and plains, cities and castles without number are met with, but they are in no wise different from those at home, so that he finally begins to weary of his search. In vain he makes inquiries; some have never heard of the land of Romance, others are familiar with the name but not with its location. The only thing which sustains the hero's courage is the reflection that this land must be somewhere, that it cannot possibly be a chimera:

> Car enfin, disois-je, si ce pays n'existoit pas réellement, il faudroit donc traiter de visions ridicules & de fables puériles tout ce qu'on lit dans les Romans. Quelle apparence! Eh! que faudroit-il donc penser de tant de personnes si raisonnables d'ailleurs qui ont tant de goût pour ces lectures, & de tant de gens d'esprit qui employent leurs talens à composer de pareils Ouvrages? [pp. 6–7].

He therefore persists, until finally, by mere accident, he stumbles upon the object of his search. Leading his horse up the high mountains of Troximanie, he eventually reaches the top, when suddenly the ground gives way beneath him, so that he rolls down in one direction, his horse in the other. Fan-Férédin finds himself at the bottom of a frightful precipice surrounded by fearful mountains, and it is evident that he owes his life to the "protection particulière de quelque Fée, de quelque Génie favorable, ou de quelqu'une de ces petites Divinités qui voltigent dans le pays des Romans en plus

grand nombre que les papillons ne volent au Printems dans nos campagnes" (p. 9).

With much hardship he makes his way to a more open place, a sort of cemetery with the remains of various creatures that frequent the land of Romance—griffins, centaurs, hippogriffs, dragons, harpies, and the like—and in the midst of these observations a centaur comes out of a cave with the carcass of a hippogriff. Although the hero is not without natural courage, and despite the fact that he, from his reading, is perfectly familiar with centaurs, this sight at first causes him some emotion, so that he hides behind a rock until the centaur has retired. Upon reflection, however, he enters the cave, vainly calling on the centaur for aid. With great difficulty he explores the cave and finally emerges into the land of Romance.

It is impossible here to enter into any details of description—there are pegasuses, unicorns, griffins, hippogriffs, centaurs, hircocerfs, chimeras, salamanders, and sirens. Boats appear as soon as one desires to cross a river or a lake, and bridges are built in an instant. There are brooks of milk and honey which are accounted for most naturally: cows and goats have such an abundance of milk, which they give spontaneously, that a brooklet of milk is formed as soon as a dozen of them are assembled; similarly, the bees alight on a tree and make honey in such prodigious quantities that the continually falling drops make a rivulet.[1]

At a certain place Fan-Férédin touches with his hand certain rocks that had attracted his attention, only to find them soft and yielding to the touch. He later learns that an unhappy but eloquent lover had recounted his torments to these rocks, which had been unable to resist his touching appeal; some had split from top to bottom, others had melted like wax, and the hardest had been softened, as described above.[2]

In the course of his peregrinations the hero is directed to the Forest of Adventures, where, with herbs plucked at random, he frees

[1] Compare in this connection the complete title of the first edition of Wieland's novel: *Der Sieg der Natur über die Schwärmerey, oder die Abentheuer des Don Sylvio von Rosalva, Eine Geschichte, worin alles Wunderbare natürlich zugeht.*

[2] Compare with this the following passage from *Don Sylvio*, II, 288 (ed. of 1772): "nachdem er sich auf einem Felsen, der zwar wie andere Felsen von Stein, aber so weich wie ein Polster war, zurecht gesetzt hatte. . . . ."

a cavalier from an enchanted sleep caused by a sorcerer in the service of a rival. The cavalier had been sleeping for a year, "sans pouvoir être réveillé que par le Prince Fan-Férédin, à qui il étoit réservé de me désenchanter." Immediately calling Fan-Férédin by name, he introduces himself as "Prince Zazaraph, Grand Paladin de la Dondindandie." He had spent several years in the land of Romance, which one enters by the gate of love and leaves by that of marriage. Zazaraph loves the beautiful Princess Anemone, with whom he expects to return to his native land within three days.

In the meantime he offers to serve as the guide of Fan-Férédin, "& trois jours vous suffiront pour connoître toute la Romancie, sans vous donner même la peine de la parcourir tout entière, parce qu'on ne voit presque partout que la même chose." There is also a disquisition on the language of the country, which is, in effect, a satire on the *préciosité* of the time. In the discussion of the geography of the country Fan-Férédin learns that there is "une haute & basse Romancie. Nous sommes ici, me dit-il, dans la haute Romancie, & elle est aisée à distinguer de la basse par toutes les merveilles dont elle est remplie." In former times the boundaries of the land of Romance were strictly guarded, the inhabitants being limited to the most celebrated heroes: Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table, Perceforêt, Amadis, Roland, Merlusine, and others. Later on Pharamond, Cleopatra, Cyrus, and the like were admitted, and thereafter the heroes and princes of Faery, of the *Thousand and One Nights*, the *Contes Chinois*. Finally when travelers and adventurers, men and women of mediocre qualities, came in it became necessary to make the division into Upper and Lower Romance.

In the course of this narrative Fan-Férédin is compelled to gap, and finds that this is "la maladie du pays . . . à peu près comme le mal de mer pour ceux qui font un premier voyage sur cet élément." For a change of air they mount a pair of great grasshoppers, which are more gentle but less speedy than the hippogriffs. The methods of travel are thereupon described, particularly the "Lettres Romanciennes," by virtue of which the traveler has no trouble about bad weather, broken carriages, and wretched inns, but lodges in the castles of princes and seigneurs, where all the ladies fall in love with him.

When Zazaraph, in the course of this recital, exhibits the portrait of his adored Anemone, Fan-Férédin recognizes in her his own sister, the Infanta Fan-Férédine. At the same time the Grand Paladin, on looking at his new friend more closely, detects certain striking resemblances between him and the brother of his beloved, so that the dénouement of the story is clearly foreshadowed. The conversation is interrupted, however, and the following chapter describes the "Ouvriers, Métiers & Manufactures de la Romancie." Meanwhile the princes approach the harbor, where various vessels are arriving, one of which brings the Princess Anemone. She had been carried off by the perfidious Prince Gulifax, and upon ultimate delivrance from him she had fallen into other perilous situations, out of all of which she eventually made her escape.

Her narrative is longer than that of Zazaraph; during its recital Fan-Férédin falls desperately in love with her friend Rosebelle, sister of the Grand Paladin. He is accepted, and the thirty-six formalities required in the land of Romance are to a large extent waived, so that the two pairs are on the point of departing for la Dondindandie to solemnize their union, this being impossible in la Romancie.

Meanwhile there is a tournament, at which Fan-Férédin carries off the prize, which he is to present to the lady of his heart. Unfortunately the ladies are all masked on this occasion, so that the hero makes the biggest blunder imaginable, presenting the jeweled bracelet to the Princess Rigriche, who is naturally very proud of the honor. Upon unmasking, she exhibits a face so ugly that Fan-Férédin takes it to be a second mask, likewise to be removed, while Rosebelle promptly faints away at the sight of this apparent perfidy of her lover. When the latter reflects upon the opinion which Rosebelle must have of him, he likewise swoons. He recovers his senses in the arms of Rigriche, who regards him as her lawful prize and refuses to yield her claim. She is described as "une grosse petite personne," and Fan-Férédin is "sans doute le premier amant qui eût rendu hommage à ses attraits, & peut-être n'espéroit-elle pas en trouver un second." When she finds herself scorned, "elle fit bien-tôt succeder aux douceurs des injures si atroces, que je n'eus d'autre parti à prendre que de lui céder la place" (p. 267).

Meanwhile Zazaraph is ready to avenge with blood the insult put upon his sister, but the matter is deferred, and ultimately explanations are made and accepted. The morrow therefore finds the company on the way to la Dondindandie. In their costly train there is nothing meaner than bridles of gold and saddles ornamented with pearls and diamonds, and their servants exhibit the richest livery. As they approach the goal a sudden, fatal moment robs the hero of his perfect happiness: "mais pour bien entendre ce cruel événement, il faut reprendre la chose de plus haut, & prévenir les Lecteurs que je vais changer de ton" (p. 271). In short, the entire story is confessed to be a mere dream. In his true character the hero is M. de la Brosse, of Lower Languedoc, whose sister has just married M. des Mottes, and, in order to make a double alliance, M. de la Brosse has become engaged to the sister of M. des Mottes. Meanwhile—

M. de la Brosse ayant la tête remplie d'une longue suite de Romans qu'il avoit lûs récemment, rêva dans un long & profond sommeil toute l'Histoire qu'on vient de lire. Après s'être métamorphosé en Prince Fan-Férédin, il fit de M. des Mottes un Grand Paladin Zazaraph. Il changea sa sœur en Princesse Anemone, sa maîtresse en Princesse Rosebelle, & composa tout le beau tissu d'avantures qu'il vient de raconter. Or ce Gentilhomme, ci-devant Prince Fan-Férédin; c'est moi-même ne vous en déplaise, & jugez parconséquent quel fut mon étonnement à mon réveil de me retrouver M. de la Brosse [pp. 272–73].

Let us now compare briefly the essential points of Wieland's story. Don Sylvio de Rosalva[1] grows up under the tutelage of an elderly maiden aunt, apparently his only relative, as a young sister had mysteriously disappeared some years before the opening of the story.

As soon as Don Sylvio had learned enough Latin from the Vicar of the village, to comprehend Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, ... Donna Menzia determined to take upon herself the care of forming the young man; and of giving him every perfection, which in her ideas, could make him an accomplished Cavalier. It was rather unfortunate, that Donna Menzia had picked up all those ideas respecting education, in *Pharamond*, *Clelia*, *Grand Cyrus*, and

[1] "My colleague Dr. Erasmo Buceta suggests that the name is probably to be traced back to Book XII of *Amadis of Gaul: Don Silves de la Selva.* The similarity is striking, and Wieland's familiarity with the *Amadis* needs no detailed proof. Book XII appeared in numerous Spanish and French editions, from which latter Wieland presumably drew, as the German editions usually change the name to *Ritter*[*Fürst, Prinz*] *Silves vom Walde.* In the preface to his *Neuer Amadis* (1771) Wieland uses the form *Silvio de la Silva.*"

other books of that stamp, which, with the *Adventures of the twelve Peers of France*, and the *Knights of the Round Table*, constituted the chief part of her library. In these volumes, she conceived, were to be found all the treasures of the most sublime and useful knowledge; and therefore thought she could no way better instruct her young pupil, than by endeavoring to inspire him with those ideas, and with that taste, which she herself had deduced from sources so pure. The happy disposition of young Don Sylvio in this respect seconded her views so well, that before he had attained his fifteenth year, he was at least as learned as his noble aunt. At that tender age he already possessed as extensive a knowledge of History, Physics, Theology, Metaphysics, Morals, Politics, the art of War, Antiquities, and *Belles Lettres*, as any of the Heroes of *Grand Cyrus* could ever attain[1] [Book I, chap. ii].

But what most charmed her in her nephew was the uncommon desire which animated him, to imitate those sublime patterns, whose high deeds and moral virtues had transported him with admiration, and to which he had so familiarized his imagination, that he was at length persuaded, it would cost him no more pains to put them in practice, than it had already done to conceive the idea of them [Book I, chap. ii].

The natural ingenuity of his soul rendered him incapable of suspecting that he could be deceived. His imagination therefore was impressed with those chimerical beings which the poets and dealers in romance exhibited to him, just in the same manner as his senses received the impression which natural things made upon them. The more agreeable he found the marvellous and the supernatural, the more was he tempted to believe them true; and especially as he had no doubt of things the most incredible: For the ignorant believe every thing possible. In this manner, the poetical and enchanted world dispossessed his brain of the true; while the stars, elementary spirits, enchanters, and fairies, according to his system, were as certainly the movers of all nature, as gravity, attraction . . . . are, in the system of a modern philosopher [Book I, chap. iii].

In addition to the books of chivalry on which he had been fed Don Sylvio one day discovered a large parcel of fairy tales, *Arabian Nights*, *Persian Tales*, and the like, which he fairly devoured:

He did not read, but he saw, he heard, he felt the whole. A system of nature, more beautiful and surprizing than all he had hitherto known, seemed to unfold itself to his view; and that mixture of the marvellous with the simplicity of nature, which characterizes most illusions of this sort, was to him an infallible mark of their truth [Book I, chap. iv].

[1] Quotations are from the first English translation (London, 1773), the text of which is based on that of the original German edition of 1764. Cf. *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXXII, 225.

Donna Menzia tried to dissuade him, but in vain:

> Enchantments, palaces of diamonds and rubies, princesses enchanted, or shut up in towers, or subterraneous palaces; together with those tender lovers, who, under the wonderous protection of a good fairy, escaped all the subtleties of a bad one; these, and the like, still kept in his imagination the quiet possession they had gained. Don Sylvio read nothing else . . . . 'Twas all his thoughts by day, and all his dreams by night' [Book I, chap. iv].

I have given in detail the description of the character and surroundings of Don Sylvio so that the identity of atmosphere in the two stories might be brought out: That a youth thus reared should fall in love with an enchanted princess, as yet unseen, was but natural, and when he one day caught a butterfly of singular beauty it was clear that this must be his enchanted princess, whom he accordingly released. The butterfly flew off, and while following it Don Sylvio stumbled upon a miniature set in brilliants. He realized that this must be the picture of his princess placed in his way by a grateful fairy.

In a subsequent dream there is a vision of salamanders and fairies, and Radiante, the queen of Salamanders, tells him to go in search of the blue butterfly in order to dissolve the enchantment and release the princess. "This great adventure is reserved for Thee. Lose no time, Don Sylvio." Accordingly he makes his preparations for the journey, on which he is to be accompanied by his squire Pedrillo and his little dog.

Meanwhile Donna Menzia has made an agreement to marry a lawyer of a nearby town, one of the stipulations being that Don Sylvio marry the lawyer's niece, whose fortune he has had in hand since her father's death. On an appointed day, Don Sylvio being still in the dark as to his aunt's project, uncle and niece arrive at the castle. Donna Mergelina, the niece, is pictured as a monster, short and stout, like Rigriche in the French story. Don Sylvio refuses to give up his princess and is imprisoned but he eventually escapes and sets out on his search for the butterfly. There are numerous adventures with salamanders, fairies, and the like, so that Don Sylvio, although never more than a few leagues from his castle, is as actually in the land of Romance as was Fan-Férédin. In a forest he and his squire rescue several young men, the escort of a young lady attacked

by kidnappers. Don Sylvio proceeds with his grateful friends to the castle of Don Eugenio, the head of the party, and the lover of Hyacinthe, the rescued lady, who in the end turns out to be Don Sylvio's long-lost sister. On the other hand, Donna Felicia, the sister of Don Eugenio, is the owner of the miniature, and Don Sylvio finally transfers his affections from the imaginary princess to her flesh-and-blood counterpart. The story thus ends in a double marriage of sister and brother with brother and sister.

In this skeleton outline I have limited myself, as in the case of the French work, to the story proper, omitting incidents and details which need not concern us here, as it is the parallelism of the fundamental plot that I have sought to bring out.

In both stories the orphaned hero, reared by a female relative and educated almost exclusively by the reading of tales of romance, sets out at the age of eighteen in search of romantic adventure, and to disenchant an enchanted person. He rescues a cavalier who turns out to be the lover of his rescuer's sister, while the hero in turn falls in love with the cavalier's sister, so that both stories end in a double marriage. In each case a short, thick-set, ugly woman tries to step in between the hero and his love, and in each case a miniature portrait plays an important part in bringing about the dénouement.

Instances of parallelism in incident are comparatively few on account of the fact that the French story has little action, its satire being mainly developed by the description of present and former conditions in the land of Romance. As Wieland's story is, on the contrary, one of action, the details had to be invented or borrowed elsewhere. One at least has its counterpart in the *Voyage*.

In the extravagant story of Biribinker, told by one of the company in order to cure Don Sylvio of his credulity, the hero finds himself within a tremendous whale, in whose interior there are lakes, islands, etc., and the rocks on the shore, without further motivation, are described as being soft as cushions. Fan-Férédin likewise gets into the bowels of the earth and at a certain place finds the rocks yielding to the touch. This condition is here motivated, however, by the statement that an unfortunate lover had been in those parts on the previous day and by his pitiful laments had caused the rocks to become softened. Furthermore, just as Don Sylvio, who gullibly

believes the Biribinker story, is finally told that it is a mere fabrication, so also Fan-Férédin breaks off suddenly with the statement that the whole thing is but an idle dream.

When we consider, finally, the aim and purpose of the French story, as expressed in the author's dedication, not much doubt remains that Wieland's plan and probably his original impulse to compose such a work came from the *Voyage merveilleux;* in the delineation of his characters, however, as well as in the arrangement and combination of his materials, Wieland followed the inspiration of his own genius.

W. KURRELMEYER

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

THE GAELIC "BALLAD OF THE MANTLE"

A well-known group of mediaeval narratives deals with a chastity-testing mantle which is brought to King Arthur's court and which causes shame to Guenevere and other ladies by whom it is donned. Only one of the women undergoes the probation successfully, thus proving herself virtuous.

Some thirty years ago Otto Warnatsch, after an examination of the available material, was convinced that, although the power of detecting human frailties is attributed to various inanimate objects in the folklore of many peoples, the peculiar form of the test occurring in the mantle poems originated in Celtic territory,[1] and more recent authorities have apparently favored the same view.[2] With regard, however, to the plot of which the mantle is the center, Warnatsch says, "Ihre literarische Gestaltung erlangte [die Mantelprobe] . . . . erst in der altfranzösischen Poesie."[3] That the mantle test found a literary setting which, although superficially similar to that in Arthurian romance, is independent of and perhaps antecedent to the Continental versions, is the hypothesis proposed in the present discussion.

It is clear at the outset that in a properly constructed narrative of the type outlined above the motive actuating the gift of the magic robe to Arthur should not only be adequately explained or implied but also be such as to comport with the character of the giver; otherwise the result of the trial loses in effectiveness, and the whole story becomes more or less frivolous and trivial. As will appear from the following discussion, the motive ascribed to the giver goes far toward establishing the relative primitiveness of the version in question.

[1] *Der Mantel* (Breslau, 1883), p. 58. The suggestion had already been made by Ferdinand Wolf, *Über die Lais*, etc. (Heidelberg, 1841), p. 176, and by F. A. Wulff, *Versions nordiques du fabliau français Le mantel mautaillié* (ed., G. Cederschiöld and F.A.W., Lund, 1877), p. 100. Warnatsch also favored the theory of Celtic origin for the magic horn, which in a group of related documents is used by the men to test the virtue of their wives.

[2] Cf. Gaston Paris, *Romania*, XXVIII, 219, n. 3. See further F. A. Wulff, *Romania*, XIV (1885), 345; Miss L. A. Paton, *Fairy Mythology of Arthurian Romance* (Boston, 1903), pp. 111 ff.

[3] Warnatsch, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

One of the oldest written accounts of the mantle test dates from the early thirteenth century and is contained in Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's *Lanzelet*,[1] the French original of which was carried to Germany in 1194. Here the magic garment is an otherworld object sent to Arthur's court by a *wîse merminne* (vs. 5767; cf. vs. 193), the guardian of Lancelot. The purpose of the gift is to bring honor to Lancelot's wife, Iblis, who alone undergoes the test successfully after many other ladies, including Ginovere,[2] have made the trial to their shame.[3] The *merminne* is to be identified with the Dame du Lac, whose attitude toward Lancelot is generally that of an excessively indulgent fairy godmother. That this conception is totally at variance with her true character has been abundantly demonstrated by Miss Paton.[4] Originally the *fée's* benevolence is prompted by purely selfish motives. She humors the hero only that she herself may enjoy his love, and a fundamental law of her essentially jealous nature precludes the possibility of her favoring a mortal rival. Confusion of types, refinement of sentiment, or ignorance of tradition may cause her affection to be regarded as Platonic or disinterested, but the story of her relations with her mortal favorite begins with a scandal about a resourceful and amorous water-woman who never shares her lover with an earth-born maiden.[5] It is therefore certain that the motive actuating the gift in Ulrich's poem is a relatively late and sophisticated invention.

The version of the mantle test usually regarded as most primitive is that found in the Old French *Conte du mantel*, which dates probably from the latter part of the twelfth century,[6] and which in a thirteenth-century manuscript is designated as a *lai de Bretagne*.[7] Here the mantle is of fairy workmanship, it is brought by a *vallet* from *une*

[1] *Lanzelet* (ed. K. A. Hahn, Frankfort a/M., 1845), pp. 134 ff.

[2] The failure of the queen is surprising, since she has only *an den gedenken missevarn*. As Child remarks, "Ulrich is very feeble here" (*Ballads*, I, 260, note).

[3] In a German poem, dating probably from the early thirteenth century and preserved in fragmentary form, the gift of a virtue-testing mantle to Arthur seems also to have had for its purpose the exaltation of Lancelot's wife. See Warnatsch, *op. cit.*, pp. 8 ff., 107 f. In the Norse *Samsons saga Fagra*, which may be connected with the version represented by the *Lanzelet* (*Romania*, XIV, 353, n. 2), the mantle is manufactured by four *fées*, but its subsequent history is of no interest for our purpose. See Cederschiöld and Wulff, *Versions nordiques du fabliau français Le mantel mautaillié*, pp. 90 f.

[4] Miss Paton, *op. cit.*, pp. 192 ff.

[5] See *infra*, p. 657.

[6] Cf. F. A. Wulff, *Versions nordiques*, p. 99; *Romania*, XIV, 355.

[7] *Romania*, VIII (1879), 31; XIV (1885), 345. Gaston Paris believed that the *Conte* is the source of Ulrich's lost original (*Romania*, X, 477).

pucele . . . . de mout lointain païs, and its use results in shaming Guenevere and other ladies and in magnifying the virtue of the *amie* of Carados Briebraz,[1] but the gift lacks even the reason implied in the *Lanzelet*. The poet was obviously content to utilize the mantle as a means of publishing the queen's faithlessness and of glorifying Carados through the stainless character of that hero's mistress,[2] without troubling himself even to suggest the motive of the sender.[3]

Other versions of the mantle test which are important for our purpose may be introduced in connection with a prose rendering of the *Conte* found in a sixteenth-century manuscript and noteworthy because of the name of the sender. In this late *Manteau mal taillé* the mantle is sent to Arthur's court by Morgain la fée. Her motive is envy of Guenevere's beauty and jealousy of the queen's love for Lancelot—"qui fut cause la faire conspirer sur la reine et toutes ses dames, telle chose dont la feste fut despartye, et par aventure si la reine l'eust fait semondre à celle feste, l'inconvenient jamais ne fust advenu."[4]

Although anger at exclusion from a feast is also attributed to Arthur's sister[5] as a reason for sending the troublesome gift in a version of the horn story found in a fifteenth-century *Fastnachtspiel*, "the motive of the slighted fay," as Miss Paton has shown,[6] "is not indigenous to the Morgain saga, and . . . . is to be regarded as the importation of an ordinary folk-lore theme into late material."

[1] Though Loth (*Les Mabinogion*, 2d ed., I [1913], 285, n. 1; 360, n. 1) regards the epithet *Briebraz* as Welsh in source, generally speaking the evidence for the Welsh origin of the story of the mantle is uncertain in date and suspicious in character. See Child, *Ballads*, I, 265 f.; Stern, *Ztsch. für celt. Phil.*, I (1896–97), 304 ff.

[2] In the *Lai du corn* the successful lady is the wife of Garadue (Caradoc) as she is of Craddocke in the English ballad of "The Boy and the Mantle" (Child, *Ballads*, No. 29). Cf. *Versions nordiques*, p. 88, n. 36.

[3] The same is true of the early thirteenth-century Norse translation of a lost French version of the *Conte* preserved in the *Möttuls saga*, and of the fifteenth-century *Skikkju Rímur*, which latter goes back to the *Conte* plus some independent source. In both the *saga* and the *rímur* the mantle is an otherworld object. In the former the garment is brought to Arthur by a *sveinn* from a *fríðasta maer . . . . fjarri yðru landi*, the hero is Karadin, and the heroine is unnamed (*Saga af Tristram ok Ísönd samt Möttuls saga* [ed., G. Brynjulfson], Kjöbenhavn, 1878, pp. 223 ff.; *Versions nordiques*, pp. 8 ff.). In the *Skikkju Rímur* the mantle is brought by a man from a courteous lady of great power (*hennar líki er valla nú*). The test results in the exoneration of Kardon, the mistress of Kaligras (*Versions nordiques*, pp. 58 ff.). On the forms of the names, see *Versions nordiques*, pp. 85, n. 19; 88, n. 36. See further Child, *Ballads*, I, 260 f. In the English ballad Gueneuer and other ladies fail to meet the test, and Craddocke's wife wins after she confesses having kissed her husband once before marriage, but nothing is said of the sender and the only suggestion of a motive is found in the boy's request that Arthur give the mantle to his "comely queene."

[4] Legrand d'Aussy, *Fabliaux ou Contes* (Paris, 1829), I, 126 ff.

[5] Called *künigin von Zipper*. Cf. Warnatsch, *op. cit.*, p. 67; Miss Paton, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

[6] Miss Paton, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

Morgain's jealousy of the love between Lancelot and Guenevere should also be looked upon as an element introduced into the story at a comparatively recent period, after the famous liaison had become an established fact in romance.[1] Equally untrustworthy is the motivation in a fifteenth-century *Meistergesang*, which represents Arthur's *swesterkint*, Laneth, as receiving from a friendly dwarf a mantle with which she revenges herself on Guenevere for casting her off and aspersing her character.[2] After examining a large number of romances in which Morgain's hatred of Arthur and his wife is ascribed to various causes,[3] Miss Paton, guided by the doubtful evidence of an episode treating of Morgain and a dangerous mantle in the Huth *Merlin* and in *Malory*, was led to suspect that the gift to Arthur of such a garment was attributed to Morgain before the sixteenth century, but the data at her disposal were too scanty to create more than a slight probability pointing in that direction.[4]

With these preliminary observations it is appropriate to examine a group of documents involving the mantle test but falling outside the field of Arthurian romance.

The Gaelic "Ballad of the Mantle" has been popular in Scotland for more than three centuries. The oldest copy, preserved in the early sixteenth-century Scottish Gaelic *Book of the Dean of Lismore*, was written down probably about the year 1500.[5] A second version, in Irish, occurs in the seventeenth-century *Duanaire Finn*.[6] A similar Irish poem, recorded in the eighteenth century, exists in the Edinburgh MS *54*.[7] Other late redactions have been discovered in

[1] Cf. Miss Paton, *loc. cit.* Morgain's desire to reveal Guenevere's guilty love is also the motive in certain versions of the horn story. See below, n. 4.

[2] Child, *Ballads*, I, 261. Cf. Miss Paton, *op. cit.*, pp. 61 ff. In *Der Luneten Mantel* a fifteenth-century *Fastnachtspiel*, Luneta uses the mantle to stir up trouble at Arthur's court, but no excuse is assigned for her action. See *Bibl. des litt. Vereins in Stuttgart*, XXIX (1853), pp. 664 ff.

[3] In the *Lai du corn* (*ca.* 1150) and its congeners, which are closely related to the mantle group and which, with it, doubtless go back ultimately to an earlier popular account of a chastity test, Guenevere and Caradoc stand out, but the motive of the gift is omitted or is as flimsy as those indicated above. Cf. Child, *Ballads*, I, 262, note.

[4] Morgain is the sender of the virtue-testing drinking vessel in the prose *Tristan* (Löseth, § 47), in *Malory* (Book VIII, chap. xxxiv), and in the *Orlando Furioso* (XLIII, 28 ff.). See Miss Paton, *op. cit.*, p. 105; Warnatsch, *op. cit.*, p. 134, n. 1.

[5] Cf. Stern, *Ztsch. für celt. Phil.* I, 294 ff., which see for the text here used. For other editions, see *Mod. Phil.*, I (1903), 145, notes.

[6] Ed., Stern, *op. cit.*, I, 301 f.

[7] Ed., A. Macbain and J. Kennedy, *Reliquiae Celticae* (Inverness, 1892), I, pp. 116 ff. Cf. Mackinnon, *Descr. Cat. of Gaelic Manuscripts* (Edinburgh, 1912), p. 163.

seven manuscripts in the library of the Royal Irish Academy[1] and in two manuscripts in the library of Harvard University.[2]

The Gaelic version of the mantle test is connected with the so-called "Fenian," more properly the Ossianic, cycle—a body of epic tradition now recognized as having had its beginnings in Ireland prior to the Scandinavian invasion (795).[3] The main thread of the narrative, which tends to grow long-winded in certain late manuscripts,[4] runs as follows:

Finn mac Cumhail and several of the *Fían*, with their respective wives, are carousing in the stronghold of Almhain. The women get tipsy and begin to boast of their virtue. While they are thus engaged there enters a beautiful girl wearing a mantle. On being questioned by Finn regarding the garment she replies that it has the power of revealing the unfaithfulness of women. In turn the wives put it on, but all except one find that it does not fit, and are severely dealt with by their enraged lords. Finn, on perceiving that the mantle, when donned by his own wife, Maighinis, rises above her ears and will not come down, slays her. Mac Reithe's wife, whose person the garment does not quite cover, confesses having given one kiss to Diarmuid (the Adonis of the *Fían*) and thus escapes punishment.[5] Finally the visitor, after announcing her name and asserting that she has never been guilty of incontinence except with Finn himself, takes her mantle and departs, accompanied by Finn's curse for the trouble she has brought.

Notwithstanding the absence of early manuscript evidence for the Gaelic "Ballad of the Mantle" and its general structural similarity to the non-Celtic versions,[6] it cannot be regarded as a simple revamping of Arthurian tradition by the substitution of Ossianic

[1] Cf. *Mod. Phil.*, X (1913), 291, n. 1. There seems to be another copy in MS *Egerton 175* (B.M.). Cf. *Mod. Phil.*, I, 146, n. 4. J. F. Campbell appears to have known the story in Irish. See his *Leabhar na Feinne*, (London, 1872), p. 138.

[2] *Mod. Phil.*, I, 152, and note.

[3] Zimmer's once famous views regarding the Scandinavian influences on the Ossianic cycle are now largely discredited. See *Mod. Phil.*, XVI (1918), 442.

[4] Cf. *Mod. Phil.*, I, 150.

[5] In the Harvard and Edinburgh MSS and in the *Duanaire Finn*, Ossín's wife also tries on the mantle, but her complete exoneration, as recorded in the Harvard copies, is probably late. See Robinson, *Mod. Phil.*, I, 151 f.

[6] A noteworthy instance of parallelism in detail occurs in the English ballad. Sir Craddocke's wife, like Mac Reithe's, finds that the mantle fits smoothly except for her toes. Upon her confessing a small fault, the garment covers her figure completely. Cf. Robinson, *Mod. Phil.*, I, 146.

names.[1] As Mac Neill has pointed out,[2] the *argumentum ex silentio* is especially liable to be fallacious in matters dealing with Ossianic tradition of the earliest period. Opposed to the theory of mere borrowing are, moreover, the popularity of the ballad in British Gaeldom (a territory in which native epics were ever preferred before the romances of the Round Table),[3] the highly barbaric nature of the action,[4] and the nicety with which the plot is fitted into the complicated framework of the Ossianic cycle.

One of the most striking evidences of this careful fitting is to be observed in the character of the owner of the mantle and the reason for her behavior. Fortunately there is abundant evidence that those who heard the Gaelic ballad in its earliest preserved form perfectly understood the cause of the visitor's malignity and that in their eyes her action was justified by the best traditions of epic procedure. The words in which she reveals her identity in the oldest text are as follows:

> Tabhraidh mo bhrat domh . . . .
> is me nighean an Deirg ghráin,
> nocha dearnus do locht
> ach feis re Fionn faobhar-nocht.
>
> Give me my mantle . . . .
> I am the daughter of Derg (Red) the fierce,
> who never committed any fault
> except sleeping with Finn of the naked sword.[5]

Bla, the daughter of Derg, or, as she is also called, Blái Derg, is well known elsewhere in Ossianic tradition as the mother of Ossín (Ossian). In the *Acallamh na Senórach*,[6] a frame story dating from the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century and embodying much

[1] See especially Gaston Paris' criticism (*Romania*, XXVIII, 219, n. 3) of Stern's opinion (*Ztsch. für celt. Phil.*, I, 306 ff.).

[2] *Duanaire Finn*, Introduction.

[3] This assertion stands, even in the face of Zimmer's list of Irish translations of Continental romances (*Gött. gel. Anz.* [1890], p. 503). Cf. *Mod. Phil.*, X, 299, n. 1; Henderson, *Misc. Presented to Kuno Meyer*, Halle, 1912, 18 ff.

[4] In only one Continental version, the *Skikkju Rímur*, does the severity of the punishment inflicted upon the guilty wives at all approximate that in the Celtic ballad. In the Norse account the offenders are banished from court. Cf. *Versions nordiques*, p. 99.

[5] Essentially the same statement is found in the Irish text of the Edinburgh manuscript (*Reliq. Celt.*, I, 117 f.). In the corresponding stanza of the Harvard manuscript printed by Robinson (*Mod. Phil.*, I, 157), the woman announces that she has never had to do with any man except her own husband, but it appears from the second line that the whole stanza is ultimately derived from one resembling that quoted from the Edinburgh text. The references to Derg and Finn are missing in the *Duanaire Finn*.

[6] Ed., Whitley Stokes, *Irische Texte*, IV, 1 (1900), p. 2. Cf. Stern, *op. cit.*, III, 614.

ancient Irish lore, Ossín, on departing from Cailte, his ancient companion in arms, goes to *Sídh Ochta Cleitigh, bhail a raibhe a mháthair, Bla inghen Déirc Dhianscothaig,* "the fairy-mound of O.C., where was his mother, Bla, the daughter of Derg of the Vehement Words." According to the Franciscan manuscript of the *Acallamh,* Ossín's destination was *Síodh Ochtair,* a reading which is supported by an Ossianic ballad, where the hero is said to have been the son of Derg's daughter and to have been born at *Cluan Iochtair.*[1] In another Irish ballad Ossín is called the son of Derg's daughter as though his ancestry were a matter of common knowledge.[2]

Epic tradition has ever delighted to attribute to its heroes amours with supernatural beings, and Ossianic story is particularly fond of representing Finn and his most famous companions as attracting the love of women from the other world.[3] Among Finn's fairy paramours Bláí occupies a prominent position, both because of her illustrious son and because of the circumstances attending her relations with the father. The earliest reference to the occurrence is contained in an eleventh-century poem found in the *Book of Leinster*[4] (compiled *ca.* 1150). The poet, after alluding to the mother of Diarmuid, adds:

> Bláí Derg din Banbai braiss,
> máthair Ossíne amnaiss.
>
> Ticed [Bláí] i rricht eilte
> hi comdáil na díbergge,
> co ndernad Ossíne de,
> ri Bláí ṅDeirgg i rricht eilte.
>
> Moreover, Bláí Derg of swift Banba
> was the mother of Ossín the fierce.
>
> Bláí used to come in the form of a deer
> into the assembly of the robbers,
> so that consequently Ossín was begotten
> upon Bláí [daughter] of Derg in deer form.

[1] *Transactions of the Ossianic Society,* I (1854), 12.

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 33. Cf. *Irische Texte,* IV, 1 (1900), p. 71; *Sil. Gad.,* I, 149; *The Dean of Lismore's Book* (ed., McLauchlan, Edinburgh, 1862), Text, p. 50.

[3] See, for example, *Todd Lect. Ser.,* XVI (1910), 48; *Rev. celt.,* XV (1894), 334; XVI, 147; *Irish Texts Society,* VII (1904), 145 f.

[4] *Facsimile,* 164, Col. 1, upper margin. Cf. *Todd Lect. Ser.,* XVI (1910), xxvi; Nutt, *Voyage of Bran,* I (1895), 151 f. Hogan mistakes *Bláí ṅDeirg* for a place-name (*Onomasticon Gadelicum,* s.v.).

The name Ossín is a genuine Irish diminutive of the word *oss*, "deer,"[1] and the story of the great warrior-poet's birth, first told to support the etymology, belongs to that extremely ancient class of primitive folk-myths which deals with animal marriage.[2] Moreover, the most recent investigations have demonstrated that the formation of the epic cycle clustering about Finn and his half-outlaw band of professional warriors began at least as early as the eighth century after Christ.[3] It may therefore well be that the story of Ossín's birth, so briefly summarized by an eleventh-century Irish genealogist of antiquarian tastes, formed part of the earliest Ossianic epic.[4] Finally the genuinely popular character of the tradition is shown by the tenacity with which it holds its place in modern folklore. That Ossín was the offspring of Finn and a deer was known to the Irish peasantry of the nineteenth century;[5] eight modern Highland Scottish accounts are referred to by J. F. Campbell;[6] and in a woman's "waulking" song from the Western Isles, of which fourteen versions were known to Campbell, Ossín addresses his mother, who is in the form of a deer, and warns her against the hounds. Both the Irish and the Scottish versions show the effects of rationalization and sentimentalism in representing the mother as a persecuted maiden temporarily under a druidic spell[7] instead of as a supernatural being who assumes the form of a doe in order to approach her lover, but her original character is obvious.

[1] Cf. Meyer, *Todd Lect. Ser.*, XVI, xviii, n. 3. As Meyer points out, Zimmer is wrong in claiming that the word is an Irish loan from the Norse *Asvin*.

[2] Cf. *Trans. Oss. Soc.*, II (1855), 161 ff. Celtic tradition constantly represents the fairy folk as associated with deer or as using these animals for disguise. See J. F. Campbell, *Pop. Tales*, II (1890), 120; J. G. Campbell, *Superstitions of the Highlands and Islands* (Glasgow, 1900), pp. 22, 27, 28; Plummer, *Vitae Sanctorum Hiberniae*, Oxon., I (1909), cxliii f.; Drummond, *Ancient Irish Minstrelsy* (Dublin, 1852), p. 52; *Transactions of the Ossianic Society*, II (1855), 169; IV (1859), 235 ff.

[3] See the studies of Mac Neill and Meyer, referred to above, pp. 654, n. 2; 656, n. 1.

[4] Cf. Nutt, *op. cit.*, II, 88.

[5] Cf. Patrick Kennedy, *Legendary Fictions of the Irish Celts* (London, 1866), pp. 235 ff.

[6] *Leabhar na Feinne*, p. 198.

[7] In the Irish account the woman is called Saav (*recte* Sadb), apparently by confusion with one of Finn's mortal wives, although it is worth noting that in the *Acallamh na Senórach*, Finn's wife Sadb is said to have been the daughter of the fairy chieftain Bodb Derg (*Silva Gadelica*, II, 172 ff.). In certain Scottish versions Ossín's mother is said to have been the famous Grāinne, whose attitude toward Finn, as established by the best tradition, precludes the legitimacy of her appearing in the rôle of Ossín's mother (cf. J. F. Campbell, *op. cit.*, p. 199; *Celt. Rev.*, I, 205). The Scottish versions, which represent the child as begotten upon the woman while she is wandering about as a doe, are more primitive than the Irish, where the machinery of the story provides for her restoration to human form long enough for the child to be conceived.

From the evidence presented above it is clear that for centuries the canny ones among the folk, who comprehend the ways of their own literature much better than many cultured purveyors of popular themes, have understood that the reciter of the Gaelic "Ballad of the Mantle" was raking up a scandal about Finn and a fairy woman.[1]

That Bláí's specific motive was recognized by those who heard the ballad in its original form may also be demonstrated from an examination of Celtic tradition. The inspiration of her malice is to be sought, not in such suspicious motives as are suggested in early Continental versions of the mantle story, but in an ancient and widespread folklore formula which may be stated as follows: An otherworld woman bestows her affection upon a mortal but, on finding her offer rejected or on being abandoned for a rival, hates as violently as once she loved.

Among the various types of heroine depicted in mediaeval literature the fairy mistress of early Irish epic and romance is noteworthy for her capricious and jealous nature. When crossed in love, she is as vengeful as any fair-haired virago among the barbaric folk to whose untutored imagination she owes her existence, and she has retained her reputation down to recent times.[2] Otherworld women who take vengeance for rejected love are found not only in the sagas of the Ulster cycle, the most extensively preserved body of ancient Irish tradition, but also in various detached romances,[3] and the large number of examples to be found in Ossianic literature shows how extremely popular was the theme during the Middle and Modern Irish periods. Of the numerous stories of supernatural beings who proffer their love to the heroes of the *Fían*, several picture Finn as suffering from the jealousy of his would-be mistress, or as escaping her wiles only by the exercise of his unusual powers of divination. A well-known Ossianic story tells of two fairy women, sisters, who simultaneously offer their love to Finn. One, perceiving that the other is about to outbid her for the hero's affections, transforms herself into a deer, lures Finn to a magic lake, and changes him into a

[1] Child was on the right track when he spoke of Derg's daughter in the ballad as "certainly a wife of Finn." (*Ballads*, I, 262).

[2] See *Trans. Oss. Soc.*, II, 102.

[3] Miss Paton's discussion (*Fairy Mythology*, pp. 4 ff., 21 f., 48) is based chiefly on material drawn from the Ulster cycle. See further Thurneysen, *Sagen aus dem alten Irland*, pp. 81 ff.; *Rev. celt.*, XXIII (1902), 396 ff.; *Mod. Phil.*, XII (1915), 641, n. 2.

decrepit, white-haired man.[1] In the *Acallamh na Senórach* an otherworld woman offers her love to Finn, but on such extraordinary conditions that her proposal is declined, whereupon she gives Finn a potion which causes a frenzy.[2] The list might be considerably extended,[3] but the episodes here noted sufficiently illustrate the theme of fairy jealousy in early Irish literature. Although it is not clear why Maighinis, among the various wives assigned by tradition to the uxorious Finn, was chosen by popular fancy as the subject of the mantle test, the considerations just set forth leave no room for doubt that the motive which underlies Bláí's action [and which occurred at once to the hearers of the ballad as the explanation of her presence in the story, is that indicated in the formula outlined above; namely, vengeance for discarded love and jealousy of a favored rival. This conclusion, if correct, goes far toward establishing the independent character of the Gaelic ballad, for, of all the mediaeval versions of the mantle test, the Celtic furnishes the most primitive and, to the student of popular origins, the most satisfactory inciting motive for the story. Moreover, the remarkable precision with which, even in matters of detail, the character and actions, not only of Bláí but of the remaining personages, are adapted to the established conventions of the Ossianic epic, the brutality of the men, and the indelicacy of the women, with never an indication of past courtly history, all tend to discredit the otherwise conceivable assumption[4] that the Gaelic ballad is a mere rifacimento of any preserved non-Celtic version. It may be added that, however late the connection of Morgain with the mantle test may have been, the establishment of the independent character of the Gaelic version lends additional color to Miss Paton's theory that the relations between Morgain and Arthur find their most satisfactory explanation in ancient Celtic accounts of the fairy amours of epic heroes.[5]

TOM PEETE CROSS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[1] A summary of the story is given in the *Feis Tighe Chonain Chinn-Shléibhe*, a late compilation of traditional materials (*Trans. Oss. Soc.*, II, 168 ff.), and is connected with the account given in the *Seilg Shléibhe g-Cuilinn*, an Ossianic ballad which has met with wide popularity (*Trans. Oss. Soc.*, IV [1861], 2 ff.).

[2] *Irische Texte*, IV, 1, p. 135.

[3] For other examples from Ossianic tradition, see *Trans. Oss. Soc.*, II, 161 ff.; *Rev. celt.*, XV (1894), 334.

[4] Cf. Stern, *op. cit.*, I, 306 ff.

[5] Cf. *Mod. Phil.*, XII, 605, n. 4.

BINDING SECT. APR 18 1980

PB
1
M7
v.16

Modern philology

65

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY